AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. III.—(XIII.)—SEPTEMBER, 1895.—NO. 3.

STUDIES OF THE BREVIARY.

WHEN Holy Church invests her ministers with their sublime dignity, she puts into their hands two books, which contain their whole duty, and which point out to them the manner of perfectly fulfilling their obligations. These two books are the Missal, which contains the formula of the great Act of Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the Breviary, wherein is found the Sacrifice of Prayer she is ever offering up to the Most High. Now, as, to use the words of the poet, "the proper study of mankind is man," so the proper study of a priest is his Priesthood; and nowhere can he find so perfect an idea of his office as that which is drawn out in these two books by the hand of the Holy Ghost. For us no other books are needed as manuals of prayer and spiritual study; and life is not long enough to exhaust their teaching, or to discover all their beauties. Each day, as we study them, new delights unfold themselves, and the old familiar words bear a fresh and ever-new meaning. Surely they are a reflection of the Eternal Loveliness of Him who is the Ancient of Days and yet maketh all things new (Cf. Apoc. xxi, 5). As they are the official expression of the worship of sacrifice and prayer which Holy Church owes to the Maker of all things, and which she pays in, by, and through, her divine Head, these two books must be, above all others, far more divine, far more instructive, far more pleasing to God. No other books does she give to all her priests; for in them we

have all that is needed to help us to walk worthy of our vocation. We have often felt the want of some practical sort of study upon these two books, and could never find in any of the learned and pious books written on the Missal or the Breviary exactly what we needed. None of them seem, as far as we know, to treat of the books from that one standpoint which gives harmony to both, and which gives the key to their meaning. We have many works on the history, the liturgical meaning, and the ceremonial uses, of each book taken by itself. But we know of no work which reads the Missal by the light of the Breviary, or the Breviary by the light of the Missal. For these two books are the sun and the moon of our ecclesiastical firmament; and, as the moon shines with a light borrowed from the sun, so does our Breviary get all its light and power from the Missal, and the full meaning and beauty of the latter is made clear by the study of the former. The late Abbé Bacuez of St. Sulpice, in his treatise on *The Divine Office*, says: "Without a serious study of the Breviary, a considerable, if not the principal part of the most interesting and devout beauties therein contained will remain always unknown and will not even be suspected to exist . . . and we may extend to the entire Breviary what Bellarmine said to the Pope (St. Pius V) about the Psalter: 'There is no other book whose use is so familiar to priests and whose sense is so little known.'" (*The Divine Office*, English Edition, p. 94). The words of the great St. Bernard, *De Modo Orandi*, also come to our mind: *Quærite et invenietis; pulsate et aperietur vobis. Quærite legendo et invenietis meditando; pulsate orando et aperietur vobis contemplando.* So we endeavored, for our own profit, to enter upon a study of these two books. Some few of the fruits of our meditations upon the Missal read in the light of the Breviary, have already appeared in the pages of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, and now we venture in all humility to offer our brethren some thoughts upon the Divine Office, in this hope at least, that they may be led, each one, to enter into the garden of delights, and to gather a nosegay of the sweet flowers that abound therein.

The first thought which strikes us, when we open our Breviary to study the contents, is: What does the Church mean by the Breviary? What is the object she wants to attain by laying upon her priests the grave obligation of reciting the Divine Office each day? The last question will be best answered by considering the office from various points of view; and first we will take the point of public prayer, as that is the aspect of the Divine Office which first attracts notice. Now, public prayer is as much a duty of society as private prayer is of the individual; and, in fact it supplies for the neglect and deficiencies of private persons. So the most perfect society which exists upon earth, that is the Church, must stand in need of the most perfect form of public prayer, one that shall truly and perfectly represent the prayer of every individual member of that society. But for public prayer there are required several conditions: (1) It must be offered in the name of all the members of the society. (2) It must be offered by an accredited official. (3) And finally, all the members of the society must in some way take part in this act. These conditions are most perfectly fulfilled in the Divine Office. It is said for all God's Church Catholic; to the honor of the saints triumphant in heaven; for the solace of souls expiating in purgatory, and for the wants and needs of all still fighting the weary battle here below. It is the prayer of all creation, and man lends his voice to all his fellow-beings, animate and inanimate, and sings his song of thanksgiving, adoration, praise, and supplication, through the Sacred Heart of Jesus, into the attentive ear of the Almighty Father. It is, in a special sense, the prayer of the Church Militant, for in it not only does the just find a voice, but also the sinner a means of bewailing his misery, and imploring pardon. It is the prayer of the Church Catholic in its fullest and most complete sense, of all God's folk whom He fore-knoweth to be His by faith and good works. It is the new song, that "sound of many waters" which St. John heard surging round about the throne of the Ancient of Days (Apoc. xiv, 2). It is the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints which ascends ever

from the golden censer borne by the angel who stands before the golden altar which is before the throne of God. (Ibid. viii, 3.)

Then again, the sacrifice of prayer is offered by one whom, after a long preparation, the Church has solemnly set apart, and "constituted in these things which appertain to God." (Heb. v, 1.) He is bidden to speak in Her name and to make intercession for all the people, to prostrate himself between the altar and the outer Court, and there to bewail the sins of his brethren and to implore the divine pity. Hence we, who are called to this honor as Aaron was, are lifted up out of our own petty selves, and are made instruments by which all creation can offer the sacrifice of prayer and praise due to the Eternal. When we open our Breviary to pray, Heaven stands attentive, waiting to swell the chorus which ascends from the earth; Purgatory adds her sad and plaintive sigh; and God Himself bends down His ear and listens. For it is not our own feeble voice alone He hears, though, blessed be His mercy, He does not despise even *us*, but it is the majestic accents of the creation He blest and said was very good, that goes up and makes glad melody before His throne. Like Atlas, who of old was fabled to bear upon his shoulders all the world, we, in very truth, bear the weight of all the world's needs, and, clothed as its representatives, and in its name, we approach the feet of our Maker, and there lay before Him the cares of all His children. What a noble and yet awful duty is ours, and what a terrible responsibility rests upon us!

Then, once more, all the members of the Church take part in the public prayer; for we priests live by the altar, and the altar is kept up by the faithful. Thus do they give us of temporal things, that we may be free from the more engrossing cares of life and able to minister to them in things spiritual; and to do, in the name of the body, what individual members cannot do for themselves. Thus, then, are fulfilled the three conditions of a public prayer.

But there is another view of the question, which comes out of the very nature of the Church, whose prayer the

Divine Office is, and who prays by means of the Divine Office. It is laid down frequently by St. Paul in his Epistles that the Church is a living body, and the body mystical of the Christ. It is united with the Divine Head, and there is a oneness of life and operation. Whatever she does, she does only in union with Jesus; and in all her relations with the Eternal Father, she acts as one with her Divine Head. His life, His sentiments, His desires, His intentions, are hers also from the very nature of the case; and she can have no life, no sentiments, no desires, no intentions, which are not also His. So when she prays it is Jesus Himself Who prays and Who gives the value to her prayers. When she pours forth supplication, adores and praises God, it is from the all-holy lips of Jesus that the Eternal Father hears the supplication, and receives the adoration and songs of praise. This is the cardinal truth upon which the very existence of the Church hangs, and the one which gives the meaning to all she is and does. *In Him we live and move and have our being.* (Acts xvii, 28.) M. Olier, the saintly founder of St. Sulpice, calls our Lord the Sole Religious of the Father; for He alone can glorify the Eternal as His Majesty deserves; He alone can satisfy His justice, He alone can merit grace, He alone can give fitting honor and grace to the Most High. Therefore, on account of the intimate union which forever exists between the members and Head of the Body Mystical, when the Church prays, Jesus prays in all His members, and for all His members: *I pray for them who shall believe in Me.* (St. John xvii, 9, 20.) Thus is He in all things holding the Headship as becometh the first born of every creature, (Colos. i, 15, 18,) and in Him doth all fullness dwell (*Ibid.* 19); and in Him, and by Him, and through Him, all the works of God's hand can render the sacrifice of prayer to their Maker.

We may now see one of the great objects of the Divine Office. Holy Church presents to God through His only Son, *our Advocate with the Father, the Christ Jesus, the Just One,* (I John ii, 1,) her petitions and praises, certain that He will be heard on account of His reverence. (Heb. v, 7.) Another object is that, in the Office, our Divine Head finds an instru-

ment whereby He can worship the Father on our behalf and in the name of all creation. This is the true way of regarding the Office, and causes us to wonder, with a great awe, that He should deign to use us as instruments for His ineffable adoration and worship. It is this view which puts the public prayer of the Church so far above all other prayers, and which gives us such an exalted idea of our ministry. So it is not so much we who pray, but we are only instruments which Jesus, the Head of Creation, the *Catholicus Patris Sacerdos*, as Tertullian calls Him, uses as a means of praising His Father in the name of all things. He it is who prays, when we say our Office; He it is who uses us, and who, as it were, depends upon us for the means of glorifying His Father as He alone can.

This view of the Office explains all its difficulties and clears away all seeming contradictions; for in all we say therein we see Jesus, considered either in Himself or as one of us; bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. He is to the Office what He is to all other questions, the great Solution and Harmoniser. The glorious and triumphant truth enunciated by St. John: *The Word was made flesh*, answers everything and gives a meaning to the life of the Church, as it does to that of each one of us. He is our Praise, as Jeremias calls Him (xvii, 14); "He is our Life," says St. Paul (Col. iii, 3); and St. Augustine tells us, (Com. in Ps. 103), that He prays *for* us as our High Priest and *in* us as our Head; and, filling us full of His own sentiments, He joins us together with Him in the homage He pays to the Father: *Magnificate Dominum Mecum, et exaltemus nomen Ejus in idipsum* (Ps. xxxiii, 3). We are one with Him, quickened with His life and filled with His spirit: *but this is a great sacrament: I speak in Christ and in the Church.* (Ep. v, 32.)

This great secret of the power and value of the Office is enough in itself to give us an unbounded love and reverence for it; for of all "the burthens of the Lord" this is the sweetest, and makes the recital of the Office our very joy, and our most cherished occupation. What earthly pleasure can compare with that of putting oneself at the disposal of the

Christ, and thus enabling Him to worship the Father in the name of all creation? How can we better further the honor of God than by being the willing means whereby His dear glory is most fully and perfectly advanced? The Breviary is not only our Office to God, but, far and above all, it is the Office which Jesus, as the God-man, owes to His Father. It is His work, it is His duty, it is His great desire and joy, and we join in all this because He has deigned to choose us as the means whereby He can accomplish the work His father has given Him to do.

So, in order to fulfil this wondrous ministry, the first and greatest means is to unite ourselves most intimately in will with our divine Head, and to place ourselves unreservedly in His hands, so that He may use us as a well-tuned harp to make a joyful melody to ravish the heart of the Father. *Domine in unione illius divinae intentionis quâ Ipse in terris laudes Deo persolvisti, has Tibi horas persolvo.* This is the meaning of the first words of our Office: *Domine labia mea aperies et os meum annuntiabit laudem Tuam.* That is: "Make use of my lips which are of themselves all helpless to say aught befitting Thy Father's glory. Make use of them, and then shall my mouth be the organ by which the praise which Thou, as our Head, pourest forth, shall ascend before the Eternal's throne." This thought also helps us to bear our own defects and involuntary want of devotion; for it enlarges our view of prayer, and raises us up far above our limited capacity. Our Lord one day told St. Gertrude when she was sweetly bewailing her defects in saying Office: "Daughter mine, look at My heart, and know for the future that It supplies all your defects. It gives My Father all the homage, and more, that you desire to give. I am always ready to second your efforts as soon as you call upon Me to help you." And St. Bernard, in commenting upon the words of the Psalmist, says, *Invenit servus tuus Cor suum ut oraret Te oratione hac*, "In order to pray I have found the Heart of my King, my Brother, my most sweet Saviour. . . . I have, if not the Heart of Jesus in place of mine, at least have I mine in that of Jesus." (*Vitis Mystica* iii, 9.) And

again, M. Olier, who shed so much light upon prayer, says: "The spirit of our Lord is like a river that flows into the vast bosom of His Father, and draws together with it everything it meets in the onward rush. It is sufficient for us to give ourselves up to Him, and to keep as close as we can to His movements by desiring what He desires. He will then carry us along with Him into the abyss of the Divinity, there to be absorbed for ever more." Therefore, in union with Him as our Divine head, and as the instrument of His choice, we will offer the sacrifice of praise to God continuously; that is, *the fruit of lips that confess His name* (Heb. xiii, 15); and we will try to make this union, which habitually exists of necessity when we are in a state of grace, an actual and explicit one. We can then apply to ourselves His own words: *Verba quae Ego loquor, a Meipso non loquor* (St. John xiv, 10). The words we say will be His words, for He lives in us, and in Him we live, and move, and have our being.

Then there is another point of view in which we must regard the Office; and for us priests it is the most important. The whole Office has reference to the Mass. It is the beautiful setting of rich, fine gold which encircles and shows off the glory and splendor of the priceless Jewel of the Mass. We prepare ourselves for worthily celebrating the Divine Sacrifice by our first visit to the Heavenly Court which we make at Matins and Lauds. The influence of the Sacrifice is carried on in thanksgiving and in practical application during our Little Hours. Then, when eventime draws nigh, in Vespers we think of our priesthood in joy and praise for the great gift received in the morning; and, as night's shades deepen upon the world, our Compline bids us be of good cheer and sleep in peace, for we dwell under the protection of the Most High, and it fills our mind with the last thoughts of the fruit of the corn and wine which has been our food, and of the oil of gladness which has been poured upon us in the life-giving Sacrifice. Thus the whole Office is redolent of the sweetness of the Mass, and at every hour of the day its fragrance meets us. This view of the

sacrifice of prayer, linked with the Divine Sacrifice, gives it a new tone and an ever fresh and delightful meaning, and it makes our day one long communion feast. This must surely be our Lord's intention, for the spirit of sacrifice which filled His Heart was not confined to the three hours' agony upon the cross; but it was the one constant force which influenced Him from the first moment of His mortal existence, and which gave the meaning to His prayer. This view of the Office, that it refers to the Mass, is often lost sight of, to our own great detriment, when we take up our Breviary. We confine our attention to the literal meaning or to the historical sense, or apply the words to the saint or mystery we are keeping. All these are, of course, good and profitable. But to neglect the thought of the Mass is to leave out part of the essential idea of the Office. It is to neglect that golden thread which runs through the entire work and binds our whole day into one harmonious whole. It is to use the Office in a way other to that which Holy Church intends. It is to miss the sweetest honey from the innermost parts of the comb. It is to leave the choicest fruit of our seven visits to the Heavenly Court; to pluck all others, and leave the very sweetest and best.

The Divine Sacrifice is the one great act of our day, the only great reality. The rite passes soon and is quickly accomplished. A bare half-hour suffices. Jesus, by our hands, offers to the Father the most perfect act of worship that can possibly be offered. The influence of this great reality *must* pervade all we do. It is a factor in our life we cannot leave out. Thus as He deigns to use us for the purpose of the Mass, so does He also use us to carry on and extend its influence by the Office, wherein we adore, thank, supplicate, and expiate in union with the Victim we have offered. Hence the two Sacrifices, that of the altar and that of the choir, are so intimately connected that any neglect of this relationship must needs be to the detriment of both. This one great point, then, one which is so often overlooked in works on the Breviary, we must ever have prominently in mind in our recitation of the Breviary.

The union of all three views is the true idea of the Divine Office, and we can not leave out one of them without becoming cramped and confined in our prayer. As the Breviary is the instrument whereby we can perform our duty of praying in the name of the Church, so are we ourselves the living Breviary which the Church offers to her Divine Head that He may praise the Father whose glory is so dear to her. But there is this difference. The Office book cannot enter into our dispositions; it is dumb and can only take a material part in our prayer. But we, our Lord's living Breviary, can and must enter into His intentions; we can and must unite ourselves to His aims, and make them our very own. Hence His prayers are ours by the union of our understanding and our will with His; and so we merit a share for ourselves personally in the graces His mighty intercession obtains. As vapors arise from the whole earth and descend again in abundant showers upon those parts of the land that God sees to need them, so the prayers which go up from the whole Church come back upon our own parched and arid hearts, and bring us the grace we need to walk worthy of our vocation. The greater the intelligence we bring to this work, and the greater the generosity of our will, the greater will be the fruit we shall deserve. For in the Office, as in all God's works, there runs the divine rule: *As ye mete so shall it be meted unto you.* The more we enter, then, into our Lord's dispositions, and the more perfectly we put ourselves at His disposal, the more perfectly shall we be prepared to receive the fruit of His prayer in a rich harvest of grace and merit.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON,
Priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

(*Continued.*)

III.—THE TRUE SOLUTION OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

WE must premise two observations, in order to render our solution of the problem clear and plausible.

Observation 1. The Synoptic Gospels are the records of the catechetical instructions of the Apostles. This is not a mere assumption, but rests on external and internal evidence. We read in as early a writer as Papias:[1] "This also the Presbyter (John) used to say: Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he remembered . . . who (Peter) used to frame his teaching to meet the wants (of his hearers)." And this record of Peter's instructions has been identified with our second gospel by Irenaeus[2], Tertullian,[3] Clement of Alexandria,[4] Origen,[5] Eusebius.[6] The Petrine origin of the second gospel is clear also from internal evidence; for, on the one hand, the minute detail with which everything is narrated, giving the particulars of person, number, time, and place, down to the very gestures, looks and words of Jesus Christ,[7] requires an eye-witness as the immediate source of the gospel. But, on the other hand, there are only four Apostles that were eye-witnesses of all that happened from the first day of our Lord's ministry, and these were John, James, Peter, and Andrew, for all of these were called by their divine Master on the same memorable day. Now we know that St. John's account of the life of Jesus differs widely from that in the second gospel; Andrew was not present at all events told in the gospel, at the raising of Jairus' daughter, *e. g.*,[8] again, the narrative of the transfiguration contains so much peculiar to

1 Euseb. H. E. iii, 39. 2 III. i, 1.

3 Advers. Marcion. iv, 5. 4 Euseb. H. E. ii, 15; vi, 14.

5 Euseb. H. E. vi, 25; ii, 15. 6 H. E. ii, 15; Dem. Ev. iii, 5.

7 Cf. iii, 5. 34; v, 22; x, 23; xi, 11. viii, 33; x, 32; ix, 35; iii, 17; v, 41; vii, 11; vii, 34; xiv, 36; vii. 34; viii, 12; i, 29; iii, 6 etc.

8 Mark v, 22.

Peter, both words and feelings, that James can hardly have been the source of all this. Internal evidence, therefore, confirms the Petrine origin of the second gospel, clearly asserted by the early tradition of the patristic writers.

It is not less certain that our first gospel, also, contains the catechetical instructions current at the time of the Apostles in the Palestinian church. Eusebius[1] says: "Matthew, having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go also to others, delivered to them his gospel written in their native language, and thus compensated those from whom he was departing for the want of his presence by the writing." The reader has no doubt noticed two important points in this testimony: first, Matthew had preached to the Hebrews, holding such an important position that his absence had to be compensated for in some way; secondly, Matthew's gospel was calculated to compensate for the Apostle's preaching, and must, therefore, contain the instructions which the evangelist had been in the habit of delivering to the Hebrew Christians.

Finally, it can be shown that the third gospel, likewise, contains catechetical instructions used by the Apostles. Eusebius[2] again has preserved the words of Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, who, in his turn, was the friend and disciple of the Apostle St. John: " . . . After their departure, Mark, Peter's disciple and interpreter, left us in writing all that Peter had proclaimed; and Luke who had accompanied Paul, gathered together in his book the gospel preached by the latter." The third gospel, therefore, contains St. Paul's preaching as the second gospel contains St. Peter's. And this may be inferred from the very introduction of the third gospel: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narration of the things, that have been accomplished among us, according as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, it seemed

1 H. E. iii, 24. 2 H. E. v 8.

good to me, also, having diligently attained to all things from the begining, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the verity of those words, in which thou hast been instructed." Here the evangelist first distinguishes between the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word who have delivered the things unto us (orally), and those that have taken in hand to set forth an (orderly and written) narration thereof; these two classes must be the Apostles and their first chroniclers. Then, in the second part of the sentence, St. Luke goes on to place himself on a level with the chroniclers; and, therefore, we infer that he too intends to write in order the oral teaching of the eye-witnesses and the ministers of the word. And, as if all this were not clear enough, he again assures Theophilus that he is going to write about those things about which Theophilus has been instructed ("orally instructed" according to the Greek text); there can be no doubt, then, that the third gospel too contains the catechetical instructions of the Apostles.

Observation 2. The catechetical instructions of the Apostles were based on that of St. Peter, but were developed according to the needs of the catechumens. We shall prove these two assertions singly.

That the catechetical instructions in the principal churches were based on that of St. Peter, may be inferred "a priori" from the two facts of St. Peter's residence in the three principal primitive churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome, and of St. Peter's primacy in the apostolic college. In point of fact, we find that even St. Paul, though he had not lived so long under the influence of St. Peter as the other Apostles, follows the same method of preaching as the Prince of the Apostles. This is plain from a comparison of his discourses in Pisidia, at Athens, and before Festus and Agrippa,[1] with those of St. Peter before two Jewish audiences and the Gentile Cornelius.[2] Besides, it has been shown that the early catechetical instructions of the Apostles have

1 Acts xiii, 15; xvii, 22; xxvi, 2. 2 Acts ii, 14; iii, 12; x, 34

come down to us in the three Synoptic Gospels, and that the second gospel in particular contains the preaching of St. Peter. On the other hand, a glance at the above tables shows that the whole of the second gospel, excepting two parables and the account of two miracles, has been embodied in either the first, or the third, gospel, or in both. It follows, therefore, that the first and the third evangelists report a catechetical instruction containing substantially that of St. Peter together with certain amplifications.

That the catechetical instructions of the Apostles were developed variously according to the various needs of the churches, may be inferred from the practical good sense of the early Christian teachers, guided, no doubt, in their difficulties by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. From the very nature of the case, in each particular church the special needs of the audience had to be considered. Those speaking to Hebrews, *e. g.*, would naturally endeavor to connect the Christian dispensation with that of the Old Testament, showing that it had been predicted therein and developed out of it. The catechist, therefore, had to appeal to the past in order to establish his claims for the present. The apostolic ministers preaching to Gentile audiences must show that Jesus had come to save both Jew and Gentile, that the Christian Redemption excluded no one, however abject his condition, however depraved his actual state of morality. The catechist, therefore, had to appeal to the future, as it were, in order to gain a favorable hearing for the present; he had to be an apostle of hope. Finally, the Christian missionary, addressing himself to the proud and practical Roman, open only to the stern realities of the present, had to harmonize his gospel-message with the present, confining himself principally to an account of those momentous facts that manifested a power superior to the Roman emperor's mighty sway, and a majesty greater than that of Jupiter and Apollo. That this is not a mere "a priori" view of the case, follows from the words of Papias[1] quoted above, in

1 Euseb. H. E. iii, 39.

which it is expressly stated that Peter used to frame his instruction according to the wants of his hearers.

Solution of the Problem. The different phenomena involved in the Synoptic Problem are sufficiently explained by the fact that the evangelists record the various catechetical instructions current in the primitive church of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome. In order to prove this statement, we shall draw attention to the manner in which our theory accounts for the material and verbal agreement of the Synoptic Gospels, in which it explains their material and verbal disagreement, and in which it elucidates the peculiarities of the three Gospels.

1. The *material agreement* of the three Synoptic Gospels has already been shown to be due to the influence of the Petrine catechetical instruction, which was embodied in the catechetical forms of the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem. No wonder, then, that our three Synoptic Gospels, or the records of the catechetical forms of Jerusalem, Rome, and Antioch, agree, not merely in relating the history of the passion and resurrection of Jesus at greater length, but also in selecting from His life principally the Galilean ministry which was better adapted for the instruction of the multitude than the Judean. For, in the latter, our Lord had to contend mainly with the learned, the priests, scribes, and Pharisees, while in Galilee He instructed the common people concerning His mission and doctrine.

2. The *verbal agreement*, too, of the three Synoptic Gospels may be explained by the fact that they record the catechetical instructions of the primitive Church. In the first place, St. Peter's preaching must have been translated into Greek, even before the apostles left Jerusalem, about twelve years after the resurrection, for the use of the more than three hundred Greek synagogues that existed in the Holy City at the time of our Lord. This translation may have been the work of Matthew, Philip, and Andrew,[1] who spoke Greek. Again, those that have experience in teaching will

1 Cf. John vi, 7, 8; xii, 21, 22.

attest that after a number of repetitions the teacher begins to explain his matter in the same words and sentences; and the identity of language will be the greater, the less acquainted the speaker is with the language he uses. In this manner it is easily explained why the Apostles who, according to tradition, exercised the sacred ministry for twelve years in Palestine before going among the Gentiles,[1] should have been accustomed to use the same catechetical formulas. This becomes the more probable, if we take into account the Jewish manner of teaching as described by Schürer;[2] after showing that to teach was, in the Rabbinic schools, identical with repeating, he concludes that a pupil had only two duties: one was to keep everything faithfully in memory, and the second, never to teach anything otherwise than it had been delivered to him, confining himself even to the expressions of his teacher, so that it was the highest praise of a pupil to be "like a well lined with lime, which loses not one drop."[3] That the practice of learning the Christian doctrine by heart existed in the early Church, may be inferred from a passage in the Clementine Recognitions,[4] where the speaker describes his labor of memorizing the words of our Lord.

3. From what has been said, it would appear that it is harder to account for the *discrepancies* of our Synoptic Gospels than for their agreement in both matter and language. Still, if we keep in mind the variation of the instruction according to the variation of the audience, we shall not be surprised to find the same variation in the written account of the oral instruction. Hence it comes

1 Cf. Apollonius, sec. iii; Euseb., H. E. v, 18; Clement of Alex., Strom. vi, 5.

2 The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, div. ii, vol. i, p. 324 f.

3 Aboth ii, 8; cf. Gfrörer, Das Jahrh. des Heils, i, 168–173. This practice may be compared with what Max Müller tells us of the oral tradition of the Rig Veda, with the statement of Dionysius of Halicarn. (t. vii, ed. Reiske, p. 819) concerning the Greek "logographers" anterior to Herodotus, with the Homeric rhapsodists, and with the Arabic people's preservation of their poetry before the times of Mohammed.

4 ii, 1.

that in the first gospel the Old Testament is quoted more frequently than in the other gospels,[1] that the value of the law is made to lie principally in the religious and moral element[2], that though the idea of universal salvation is plainly expressed[3], and the exclusion of Israel in favor of the Gentiles bluntly stated,[4] the prerogatives of the Jewish nation appear in Christ's genealogy traced only up to Abraham,[5] in the omission of the seventy disciples, the representatives of the nations, in the prominence of the twelve, the representatives of Israel[6], in the equivalent exclusion of the Samaritans,[7] in the first discourse of Jesus declaring the inviolability of the law,[8] in the sacredness of the Sabbath,[9] in the Jewish head and foundation of the Church,[10] in the declaration about the temple,[11] and in the evangelist's eschatology.[12]

In a similar manner we can account for the omissions and additions of the third gospel. *a*. Since the gospel is of Pauline origin, it carefully omits anything that could be detrimental to the twelve, or, at least, it excuses them : hence the hard words Jesus spoke to Peter, the latter's oath on occasion of denying his Master, the flight of the twelve in Gethsemane, the ambition of the sons of Zebedee, are omitted ; the Apostles, slept, indeed in the garden of Olives, but 'for sorrow' ; they were incredulous after the resurrection, but 'for joy' ; before the choice of the first four, Jesus works the miracle of the miraculous draught of fishes (omitted by the first and the third evangelist) ; before the choice of the twelve and their mission, Jesus prays, and Peter is bidden to strenghen his brethren after his conversion.

b. The third gospel, containing as it does the Antiochian or Paulinian formula of catechetical instruction, omits also everything that would be uninteresting or offensive to the Gentile hearers. Hence those portions that connect the

1 i, 23 ; ii, 6, 15, 18, 23 ; iii, 3 ; iv, 14 ; viii, 17 ; ix, 13 ; xii, 7, 17, 40 ; xiii, 14, 35 ; xv, 8 ; xxi, 5, 16, 42 ; xxiv, 15 ; xxvi, 31 ; xxvii, 9.
2 Cf. xxii, 40 ; xxiii, 33, etc. 3 xxiv, 14 ; xxviii, 19.
4 viii, 12 ; xxi, 1 ff. ; xxi, 28, 53 ; iii, 91. 5 i, 1–17. 6 Cf. x, 23.
7 x, 5 ; cf xv, 24 ; vii, 6. 8 v, 17 f. ; cf. xi, 13. 9 xxiv, 20.
10 x, 2 ; xvi, 17 f. 11 xxvi, 61. 12 xvi, 28 ; xxiv.

Christian dispensation with the Old Testament are wanting in the work of St. Luke; such are the description of John the Baptist, the disputes with the scribes from Jerusalem, the saying that Elias had already come, the discussion on the Mosaic law concerning divorce, the question of the lawyer "which is the greatest commandment," many expressions in the discourse on the last day, the anointing of Jesus "for His burial," the allusions to the prophecies and the temple in the history of the passion, etc. The condition of Jesus' friends at Nazareth, the history of Herodias, and similar incidents have been omitted in the third gospel, as being of less interest to a Gentile circle of readers. Finally, St. Luke follows the Antiochian catechetical formula in omitting the story of the Syro-Phœnician woman containing the hard words of Jesus concerning Gentiles, and similar matter that could have only repelled his readers.

7. In the third place, St. Luke has added an amount of material that was well calculated to attract Gentiles, and encourage all classes of readers to follow the divine Master. Who can doubt that in this particular too he has remained faithful to the catechetical formula of his master St. Paul. He shows in his gospel that Jesus has not limited His salvation to any class or any condition of life; the child and the grown up man, the male and the female sex, the rich and the poor, the learned and the unlearned, the just and the sinner, the Jew and the Samaritan, the son of Abraham and the Gentile are alike called by Jesus to share in the benefits of His redemption. It is for this reason that the third evangelist traces back our Lord's genealogy to Adam, the father of all men; that he depicts the history of the childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus himself; that he pictures for us the angels announcing at Jesus' birth peace to all men of good will, and the poor shepherds adoring at the crib in Bethlehem: that he tells us of the band of pious women ministering to the wants of their divine Master, and of the poor sinner out of whom He had cast seven devils, anointing His feet; that he adds the history of the miraculous draught of fishes, of the widow's son at Naim, of the woman with

the spirit of infirmity, of the man with the dropsy, of the ten lepers, of the healing of Malchus, and the parables of the two debtors, of the good Samaritan, of the importunate friend, of the rich fool, of the barren fig-tree, of the lost pieces of silver, of the prodigal son, of the unjust steward, of Dives and Lazarus, of the unjust judge, and of the Pharisee and the publican.[1]

4. The *verbal discrepancies* of the Synoptic Gospels are more easily explained than their material disagreements. Since we have seen that the catechetical formulae of the Apostles varied according to the needs of the audience, it follows that what they had in common received a different setting in the various forms. It is natural that the verbal expression should be adapted to the rest of the catechetical formula. Besides, we have in Sacred Scripture instances in which the same event is told by the same inspired writer under varying conditions, and we find that these different accounts present precisely such discrepancies of expression as we find in the parallel passages of the Synoptic Gospels. This fact the reader may verify in the repeated account of St. Peter's vision,[2] and again in the repeated history of St. Paul's conversion.[3]

5. The fact that the three Synoptic Gospels are the written record of the catechetical instruction in the Apostolic Church, accounts also for the other phenomena involved in the Synoptic Problem. The dualism of the second gospel, *e. g.*, is explained by the fact that St. Mark was for some time the companion of St. Paul; for we find that he journeys with Paul and Barnabas to Pamphylia, and that he was again in Paul's society at Rome. This supposes, at any rate, that he was well acquainted with both the Jerusalem catechetical

1 Cf. v, 4–11; vii, 11–18; xiii, 11–17; xiv, 1–6; xvii, 11–19; xxii, 50, 51; vii, 41–43; x, 25–37; xi, 5–8; xii, 16–22; xiii, 6–9; xv, 8–10; xv, 11–32; xvi, 1–13. xvi, 19–32; xviii, 1–8; xviii, 10–14; iii, 10–14; xix, 41–44; ix, 28–36; xxii, 44; xxiii, 7–12; xxiii, 27–31; xxiii, 34; xxiii, 40–43; xxiv, 13–31; xxiv, 50–53; ix, 49–56; xxvii, 11–19; xix, 10; vii, 36–50; viii, 43–48; etc.

2 Acts. x, 10 and xi, 15.

3 Acts, ix, 2; xxii, 5; xxvi, 12.

formula—for he was a native of Jerusalem, and lived there the greater part of his life—and that of Antioch used by St. Paul. What wonder, then, if he combines in at least seven passages the expressions occurring separately in the two formulae? Again, it has been often noticed by grammarians that precisely those words that are used most commonly by the people are most irregular. On the same principle, those parts of the catechetical formulae that were repeated most commonly by the early Christians, present the most striking discrepancies of expression in the Synoptic Gospels. This is the case in the history of the passion and the resurrection, in the Lord's Prayer, in those parts of Christ's teaching that enter most practically into our daily life, and that would be quoted by martyrs and confessors alike under the stress of difficulties; such are the moral principles referring to the patient bearing of the cross, and the necessity of self-abnegation. In those parts, on the contrary, that would be repeated mainly in the church or the school of catechumens, the Synoptic Gospels present a greater agreement.

We shall not here attempt to explain the Aramaic idioms found in the third gospel where the parallel passages of the first and second gospel have pure Greek expressions, though this might be done from the nature of the Antiochian formula of catechetical instruction; nor shall we reproduce the attempts of some writers to divide our Synoptic Gospels into the daily lessons that must have been consecutively gone over in the schools of catechumens.

That this theory is not destitute of external authority follows from the names of the authors who have adopted it: Cornely,[1] Friedlieb,[2] Schegg,[3] Bisping,[4] Knabenbauer,[5] Heinrich,[6] Le Camus,[7] and also the Protestant writers,

1 Introd. iii. pp. 184, ff.

2 Österr. Kathol. Vierteljahrschr. 1864, pp. 68, ff.

3 Evang. des h. Mark. pp. 12, ff. 4 Exeget. Handb. i. p. 15, ff.

5 Stimmen aus M. Laach, 1881, xxi. pp. 297, ff. 6 Dogmatik, i. p. 721.

7 Vie de N. S. Jesus-Christ, 1883, i. pp. 28, ff.

Gieseler,[1] Ebrard,[2] Schaff,[3] Westcott,[4] Hase[5], Wichelhaus, Kalchreuter, Lange. If any one should wonder at God's seemingly useless action of inspiring material and expressions in the second and third evangelist that had been inspired in the first, let him call to mind the wise saying of Ecclesiasticus:[6] "All these things live, and remain for ever, and for every use all things obey him. All things are double, one against another, and he hath made nothing defective."

A. J. MAAS, S.J.

Woodstock College, Md.

THE HIDDEN PHASES OF FATHER TOM BURKE'S PRIESTLY LIFE.

IF a search-light were turned upon the character of the heroes of history, how few of them would stand revealed as worthy of the admiration of mankind! Their hidden life would show them up as men moved by ignoble passions and directed by low principles, factitiously eminent by reason of the commanding circumstances in which they were placed by Providence. But the heroes of religion, who shrink from fame, would, if the secret workings of their spirit were disclosed to the world, seem truly great. They would be seen as the conquerors of self. And if their struggles in the long conflict that led up to their final victory were recorded, they would grow in favor and reputation with their fellowmen and serve as an inspiration to others in self-denial, altruism, and duty to God.

One of the men of our own times who rise in honor in proportion as they are better known, is the late Dominican friar and famous preacher, Father Thomas Burke.

His exoteric life is easily sketched. He was born in Galway in 1830, the only son of a poor baker. In his seven-

1 Histor. krit. Versuch, Leipzig, 1818, pp. 53, ff.
2 Wissensch. Krit. d. Ev. Gesch., 1868, third ed.
3 Apostolic Christianity, 1882.
4 An Introduct. to the Study of the Gospel, sixth ed. 1882,
5 Gesch. Jesu, 1876, p. 23. 6 xlii. 24.

teenth year he sought admission to the Order of Preachers, and was sent to make his novitiate, first to Perugia in Italy, later to St. Sabina, in Rome, and next, while still a novice and sub-deacon, to Woodchester, in England, in the capacity of Pro-Novice-Master to a new foundation. He was ordained priest by Dr. Burgess, Bishop of Clifton, on March 26, 1853. Shortly afterwards he took his degree as Lector in Sacred Theology. In 1855 he was recalled to Ireland, and became Novice-Master in the community at Tallaght. Nine years later, he was summoned back to Rome by the General of the Order, and appointed Regent of Studies in the Convent of San Clemente, the scholasticate of the Irish Province. Of this house he was soon after chosen Prior. He returned to his own county in 1867, but two years later he was once more in the Holy City as theologian to the Bishop of Dromore during the Vatican Council. In the capacity of Definitor of the Irish Province, he attended the Chapter held in Ghent in 1871, and while there he was made Visitor to the Province of the United States. He spent eighteen months in America during which period he delivered no less than four hundred lectures and preached unnumbered sermons. In 1873, he returned to Ireland. He was elected Provincial, but declined the office. He spent ten more years in an unbroken round of pastoral duties, retreats, lectures, sermons, etc., etc., while suffering from the encroaches of an interior ulceration that finally destroyed his life.

To the multitude, therefore, he was known as the popular preacher whose lectures moved great crowds to laughter and to tears, to generosity and to penance, to love for truth and to fidelity to religion; as the distinguished scholar whose acquirements as a student of history, linguist, philosopher and theologian were extraordinary; as a brilliant wit celebrated for his *bon mots* and his rare skill in the art of conversation; and, above all, as the illustrious Dominican whom his brethren delighted to honor and to obey.

But the monk of the cloister and the cell, him the crowd knew not.

A friar of the English Province has attempted to do for

Father Burke what Père Chocarne did for that other conspicuous Dominican, Lacordaire—expose his inner life to the gaze of the world for the sake of edification—and, though he has not entered into equally ample details, he has produced a meritorious and fascinating monograph.

The great central fact of Father Burke's career was his priesthood. He never lost sight of it. From it radiated his aspirations and his actions, and to it his prayers, his virtues and his works of mercy were referred back to test their fitness for him. From the day of his ordination he set up a high ideal for himself: "This life is a God-like life; this profession is an angelic profession; how can I find words to express the full sanctity of this state?" And to that ideal of holiness he steadily tended unto the day of his death. To give God all the glory that he could, to rise to the height of virtue designed for him, and to take care that no soul lost a grace through negligence in his ministry—these motives dominated him. He feared the curse threatened against those who do the work of the Lord fraudulently. Hence his recollection before the altar, his attention in the recitation of the divine Office, his mortifications, his respect for the rule of his Order, his devotedness to the confessional, his eagerness to preach. "The grandest career," he said himself in his last days, "that ever man the most ambitious proposed to himself, is to serve the Church of God," and, after he was gone, the English Jesuit Father Clarke bore this testimony to his main motive: "God and the Church were his one thought . . . it was the work God had given him to do that absorbed his thoughts." Similarly, Bishop Brownlow said of him: "I never saw him out of his religious habit, and to me he was always the Dominican friar first of all. His wit, his varied information, his marvellous powers as a linguist, his exquisite taste and tact, his intense delight in music and poetry,—all these things seemed to me to be in him perfectly subordinated to his character as a priest and a monk." This opinion is corroborated by one of his brethren in this country, who was frequently his companion during his sojourn here, and who does not hesitate to say: "I have

known many excellent priests, secular and regular, and some bishops and archbishops, but Father Tom Burke was like a born churchman—he was the most typical ecclesiastic I ever met."

Having consecrated himself to the service of God in religion, Father Burke, sought to know the predominant fault of his character for the purpose of plucking it out, fruit, flower, branch, stalk, and root. It was vain-glory. "That is the rock," he once confided to a friend, "on which I fear to split." With a firm will, stout heart, and a trust in grace, he set about acquiring the opposite virtue of humility by prayer, by penance, by meditation, and by practice, and kept up the pursuit of it resolutely from the moment that he perceived his need of it until the very end. It was a hard struggle. "He seemed so naturally humble," wrote his first biographer, "that few ever suspected the poignant pain it gave him to cultivate habits calculated to earn the contempt of worldlings." "His warm Irish blood," thus testifies his brother Dominican, "grew hot at the thought of contempt, and yet he courted it again and again by witticisms at his own expense. His own words were: 'I would rather be injured than insulted and despised.'"

He persistently made light of his orations, alluded to them as "thunder and turf," submitted them to his novices for correction, and accepted the changes that they suggested, and to an admirer who had praised one of his sermons, he wrote: "Never speak to me of my preaching; remember there is such a thing mentioned in Scripture as a man who, while preaching to others, might himself become a castaway."

When he was first sent to Tallaght, he frequently swept out the church as though he were a lay-brother, and on Saturday, when confessions were being heard, he would go kneel among the waiting throng and take his turn to receive the sacrament.

Crowds hung on his words enraptured, churches vied with one another to secure his services, the newspapers were enthusiastic in their reports of his eloquent discourses, yet he never lost his head through this popularity, and still the

wonder grew, how in the midst of such excitement he could remain unmoved. "The world forgot," explains one of his brother-monks, "that after his brilliant orations he retired to that quiet spot whose only ornaments were a crucifix, a few sacred pictures, and a few books, and that the routine of the secluded life was made up of meditation, psalmody, and prayer."

"He knew that he was a great man," writes one who was dear to him, "and that his was an illustrious name. He had taught in the schools of philosophy and theology with great success; yet no one could say that he ever made the slightest pretense to learning or eloquence. In his appearance he was simplicity itself. His winning humility of manner endeared him to all. His last duty at night brought him to kneel at the Prior's feet to receive a blessing before he retired to his room."

To hide his greatness, he acted the fool and the merry-Andrew, carrying his comic tendencies so far as at times to sky-lark in the sacristy, (though in the sanctuary no one was more devout and recollected) so that even some of his brethren thought, before they knew him well, that he was little better than a buffoon. These pranks served him a turn he sought from them, when the proposal was under consideration to make him a bishop. His critics alleged that his jollity was unseemly for the episcopal dignity, and he himself protested: "If as a friar I am unfit to discharge my duties, how much more unfit would I be to discharge the duties of a Bishop."

"His humility," declares his latest eulogist, "often took a practical form—that of seeking out public humiliations; and this, not merely from his religious brethren, who would have understood his motives, but also from men of the world—from those who admired him and strove to flatter him, but who would not appreciate what was to them unintelligible, and who would consequently misconstrue his words and misinterpret his actions. His naturally unprepossessing appearance, his lowly birth, everything that could help to lower him in the eyes of men, was called into requisition. He may

almost be said to have rivalled St. Philip Neri in his fertility in devising expedients to crush human respect and self-love. Once, when paying a call, he rose to go, saying that he had his shoes to clean. Those present protesting against such a proceeding, he answered: 'If I were not a friar I might not have any shoes to clean.' Another time, when paying a call upon some friends, his wearing apparel was so remarkably shabby that he was attacked on the point. He explained that his coat had been the property of a father who was much stouter than he was; his shoes had belonged to a second, and his hat to a third; this last was so much too large for him that he could only keep it in place by rolls of paper place inside the lining. Wellnigh countless are the anecdotes of this kind preserved to us. And in this, as in everything else, his natural wit did him good service. When standing in the midst of a distinguished company, he might be heard, in loud tones and with an assumed but emphatic brogue, disclaiming all connection with the blue-blooded Burkes of Galway, but, at the same time, assuring his audience that, though his father was only a poor baker, he was yet one of the best-bread Burkes in the country."

His pet maxim for his novices was: "You must be as humble as a door-mat and as pliable as porridge."

He detested popular ovations. When he returned from Rome to deliver his glowing panegyric of O'Connell, he magnetized his audience, and then, not waiting a moment to receive the greetings and congratulations of the throng of prominent persons that flocked to the convent to take him by the hand, he hurried off to a hospital to see a poor woman, a penitent of his, who had written to him in Italy that she longed to have his blessing before her death. When he reached her bedside she smiled her welcome and said faintly: "Father, I waited for you!" and she died before he left. Meanwhile the great audience still clamored for another sight of the orator who thrilled them to the core of their hearts with his vivid encomium of their nation's hero.

When father Burke came to America he selected for his voyage the steamer carrying the most steerage passengers.

On the way over he spent a part of every day among them, instructing, advising, and shriving them—hearing more than three hundred confessions and entreating them to be true to the Faith in the new land. He was requested by the other saloon passengers to preach to them, and he consented but on condition that the poor in the steerage, who chose to hear him, should be allowed to come up to listen to the sermon. Thus he constantly identified himself with the lowly. He was humble in the condition of his birth and by his profession as a monk, and he insisted on his rights, as it were, when he made his world recognize these facts. Once, when his physician urged him to go abroad to a celebrated health-resort, he replied: "What a pretty thing to see a poor Dominican associated with all the grand health-seekers. If I cannot get my health in Ireland, I am sure to get a grave there."

"What struck me most," is the testimony of one of his brethren, "was the solidity of his virtues. Though praised on all sides, I can honestly say that I never saw a more completely and truly humble man, with a true and genuine humility." And another friar, writing after his death, stated: "I need hardly say that he was never known to give cause of offense to any one. The world may speak of the great scholar and splendid orator, but only those in daily and hourly contact with him can speak of his unvarying sweetness of disposition, his tender piety, his complete self-abnegation, his marvellous modesty. The one thing that could bring a cloud to his face was to single him out in any way for distinction. Truly he was to us all a splendid example of humility." In the same tenor was the beautiful tribute paid to him by Cardinal Manning: "We shall no more hear that eloquent voice, eloquent because so simple, for in all, he spoke for God; he remembered God and forgot himself; it was the eloquence, not of study or self-manifestation, but of the great soul speaking with God and for God. The whole man spoke, and yet in the pathos and beauty and light of what he spoke, we never remembered the speaker."

Only a short time ago, another tribute was paid by Bishop

McCormack to Father Burke's humility, at a great mass meeting held in Galway for the purpose of erecting a memorial to him in that city. "Father Burke," said the Bishop, "was not only a great preacher, but also a great priest. He was distinguished for his eloquence, but he was still more distinguished for his humility. After all his eloquent speeches and splendid sermons and great achievements, which would have turned another man's head, he was never in the least affected—he had still the same humility. This was the crowning feature of his character."

Next to Father Burke's humility, and buttressing it, was his love of prayer. He would spend hours on his knees before the Blessed Sacrament. He took to heart those words of St. Bernard: "*Concha esto, non canalis*—be a reservoir, not a channel," and the saying of Blessed Louis Mary Grignon de Montfort, when pressed to shorten his devotions in order to give more time to active works: "Leave me alone as yet; what good shall I be to others if I am no good to myself?"

Accordingly his meditation, his Mass, his Office, and his other prayers called forth his utmost diligence and devotion; and in communion with God he sought his highest utility. Once, when he was at San Clemente, in Rome, some friends called to see him. They were told that he was in the church and they went there to hunt him up. They found him absorbed before the tabernacle. Loth to disturb him, they sat down to wait for him to finish his adoration. The minutes passed to the quarter-hour, the half-hour, the hour and beyond, yet he remained motionless in prayerful contemplation, and they, edified by his piety as much as they could have been by any words of his, went away without speaking to him.

Father Burke's devotion to the Blessed Virgin was tender, strong, filial, fruitful, and comforting. How could it be otherwise with him, an Irishman, a Catholic, and a son of St. Dominic? From his boyhood up he was her faithful client. He was predestined, as it were, to be one of hers, for he was born on the Feast of her Nativity, and he died on the Feast of the Visitation. "Since I came to the use of reason," he once said, "and learned my Catechism and mastered the idea

that was taught me of how God in heaven planned and designed the redemption of mankind, the greatest puzzle of my life has been—a thing that I could never understand—how any one, believing what I have said, could refuse their veneration, their honor, and their love, to the Blessed Virgin, Mother of Jesus Christ." His immediate preparation for his sermons was always the recitation of three "Hail, Marys," and his last words were: "Help of Christians, pray for us!"

As an outcropping of this reverence for the Mother of our divine Lord, was Father Burke's fondness for the rosary. "His beads," says his first biographer, "were never from his side by day, he wore them around his neck at night. . . . Sleeping or waking, walking or working, his fingers always held the tangible pearls of the rosary."

"I could sleep," said Father Burke himself, "without the least fear on the crater of Mount Vesuvius, if I had our Lady's Rosary in my hands." In his last years, when he had returned to Tallaght broken down in health and making his final preparations for eternity, it was a common saying among the novices, "There goes Father Burke with his stick and his rosary."

Father Burke cultivated cheerfulness. He used to say: "There's no law that the pious should be dull." He was naturally bright, and he gave play to his love of fun, his sense of humor, his nimble fancy, and his power of mimicry. Often he would keep his brethren in convulsions of laughter during the recreation hour with his comic stories and his clever acting. But his mirth was often assumed, either to enliven others, who needed to be cheered, or to rid himself of fits of depression, to which he was subject. His liveliness was made extravagant, too, as has been said, to bring contempt upon himself and to ward off the responsibilities of the mitre, which were offered to him more than once. Yet, withal, even in his gayest moods, he never wilfully wounded charity or hurt the feelings of any of his brethren. His liveliness, besides, helped him to bear the excruciating sufferings of the last decade of his years. An anecdote is told of him that shows the use to which he put his pleasantry

and the effort that it sometimes cost him. At Tallaght, even at the time when he was nearing his end, he was the delight of the recreations and the novices looked to him to amuse them. One day when the bell for recreation rang, he was prostrate in bed in an agony of pain. But he got up and crawled to the community room, supporting himself on his way to it by leaning against the wall of the corridor. At the door, he straightened himself up, put on a pleasant expression of countenance, and walked in. Soon he was in the midst of a comic recitation that required also considerable pantomime. The novices roared with the laughter that they could not suppress. In the midst of the fun he fell down in a faint. But they, thinking that his fall was part of the performance, kept up their hilarity, telling one another that his acting was superb. He came back to consciousness while the merriment was still kept up, and, taking in the situation, went on with the recitation without undeceiving them as to the reason of his collapse, or letting them suspect that he was in acute distress.

Father Burke's mortifications are not revealed by his brother in religion. But if, as one who knew him intimately assures us: "His inner life was as beautiful as that of his own St. Dominic," the spirit of penance was not absent from among his virtues. His fortitude in sufferings, an instance of which has just been related, is assurance that, like St. Paul, he filled out in his own body the measure of the sufferings of Christ.

After his return home from America, he became more and more of an invalid. He had overtaxed his strength in this country, and his health rapidly declined after he went back to Ireland. Yet he did not spare himself so long as he could stand on his feet, nor did he seek any relaxation from the severity of the rule while he could possibly observe it. "These last years of his life," writes his brother friar, "when his fame as a preacher was well established, were the years of his greatest activity, an activity which seems quite incompatible with the suffering life he really led. It even seems to us, who perhaps hardly know what suffering

is, to be altogether impossible that a man who is suffering pains should be able to preach an impassioned and eloquent sermon full of cogent argument and minuteness of detail, or at another time to keep his fellow-men in convulsions of laughter by his witty sallies."

His pain was not continuous, but came and went, lasting for hours or days at a time. When he had a respite he missed his cross. On one of these occasions he said, "I have been three days without pain. I don't know myself or feel right at all without it. I think I must pray for a little."

"Only a few days before his death," says his latest biographer, "he wrote several letters of introduction for one who had applied to him. These were addressed to sympathising friends in America and must, as their dates tell us, have been written at a period of great suffering, no word of which is breathed in the letters. His doctors, of course, urged the necessity of long and perfect rest. But rest, for one of his temperament, was out of the question. He felt with Macbeth: 'If die I must, I'll die with harness on my back.' Preaching was his vocation and his greatest delight, yet it was when in the pulpit that he felt the most acute pain. The beads of perspiration stood out upon his forehead and rolled down upon his face, evidence of the agony he was undergoing, as those will remember who were privileged to hear his sermons at the opening of St. Dominic's, Haverstock Hill. When the time for the opening of the present church came, Father Burke, who had promised to preach, was stretched upon a bed of pain. Yet despite the entreaties of his friends he insisted upon coming over from Ireland to fulfill his engagement. Those who saw him then, who heard the five sublime discourses with which he enthralled his audience, and who saw how, after those superb displays of oratory, he dragged himself back to his bed of ceaseless pain there to regain strength for the next effort, looked on him with a sort of awe, as upon a man whose whole desire was to spend himself and be spent in the service of God and his neighbor."

After those sermons he went back home to Tallaght to die.

But one more self-sacrifice was to be asked from him, one more opportunity was to be granted to him to suffer for others. There was famine in Donegal and the orphans there were without food. Would he preach a charity sermon to save them from death by hunger? Willingly. So, in the presence of an immense congregation, he mounted the pulpit for the last time, and though every sentence caused him a pang, he delivered one of the finest addresses that he ever preached. It cost him, however, what was left of his life. He lingered after it for a space, but the seal of death was on his brow before he finished it. His work was done. His course was finished. In effect he had laid down his life for the poor children for whom he pleaded. The end came at last and the news was flashed around the globe: "Father Burk is dead." Yes, the poor worn body was dead but the heroic soul, who will doubt that it, resplendent and blissful, has entered into the joy of its Lord?

L. W. REILLY.

Hanoverville, Md.

A QUESTION ABOUT THE LORD'S PRAYER.

"Why does the Catholic version of the Lord's Prayer, as given in all our authorized prayer-books, say 'Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us,' when the Douay Bible says, 'Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.'—Matth. vi, 12.—St. Luke says 'sins,' xi, 4."

A brief answer to the question would be that the Douay version of the Lord's Prayer in St. Matthew never took the place of the previously accepted and popular form (or forms) found in our books of devotion. The reason is that a new

vernacular version of the Holy Scriptures is something entirely independent of, and need have no necessary influence upon, the extracts from the Bible contained in the vernacular ritual of the Church. However, as many a one has, no doubt, been struck by the seeming discrepancy between the Douay Bible and the prayer-book version of our Saviour's words, a fuller explanation of the variance and its causes may prove acceptable. Such an explanation requires that certain factors be taken into account; these are introduced under the following heads:

I. The verse of St. Matthew as it appears in the Greek.
II. The verse of St. Luke—also in its Greek form.
III. Do the two reports of our Lord's words harmonize?
IV. The two English translations.
V. The prayer in its ritualistic aspect.
VI. When the word "trespass" was first used.

I. *The verse of St. Matthew as it appears in the Greek.* . . . . . It runs: *Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.*

There are unimportant manuscriptal differences — *viz:* *ὀφιλέματα, αφήκαμεν*, etc. The verse, leaving *φειλήματα* for the present untranslated, literally expressed in English would be about as follows: "And dismiss (or send away from, or discharge) to us our . . . even as we dismiss . . . to those owing us."

In regard to the import of *ὀφειλήματα*; at a glance one sees its relation *ὀφειλέταις*. Both indeed have origin in the *verb* *ὀφείλω* which means to owe—1° to owe money; 2° to be indebted in a broader sense—to be bound by obligation, or by duty, or by necessity to do something. The meaning of the *noun* *ὀφείλημα* is, as would be expected, (1°) That which is justly or legally due, a debt; hence the Septuagint translator uses it to express the Hebrew מַשָּׁאָה (fr. נָשָׁא, to lend money at usury) in Deut. xxiv-10: *Si debitum fuerit in proximo*

tuo, debitum quodcumque, non intrabis in domum ejus pignorare pignus ejus.[1] In the same sense the word occurs in Romans, iv, 4: "Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned according to grace, but according to debt," *i. e.*, the reward is reckoned not as a favor, but as a debt;—(2°) ὀφείλημα (as its source ὀφείλω) means *indebtedness* in its broader sense, and hence, *offence, sin.*[2] It is not strange that the one word should express *offence* as well as *debt;* in the popular Jewish tongue of Palestine at our Lord's time the term *chob* (חוב), or its feminine form *chobah* (חוֹבָה) had exactly this twofold meaning 'debt' and 'sin.' It is in line with this fact that ὀφειλέτης should mean (1°) one who owes money (or its equivalent); (2°) one held by some obligation or duty; and (3°), as the Jewish *chajjab* (חיב) one who owes penalty, or of whom God can demand penalty as something due; thus in Luke xiii-4: "Or those eighteen upon whom the tower fell in Siloe and slew them; think you that they were debtors (ὀφειλεται) above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem?" The full force of the verse, then, would be in English: And do Thou forgive to our offences or sins, even as we forgive those offending us.[3]

II. *The verse of St. Luke also in its Greek form.*—*Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν.*

The manuscriptal differences here are more important than in the previous case; we will refer to them shortly when their bearing may better appear. A literal translation of the present reading, leaving ἁμαρτίας by, would run somewhat in this wise: "And dismiss to us our . . . for even ourselves dismiss . . . to every one owing us." Ἁμαρτία is from

1 "When thou shalt demand of thy neighbor anything that he oweth thee, thou shalt not go into his house to take away a pledge."—Douay translation.

2 Cf. the parable in Matth. xviii-24 ff. where the sinner's relation to God is illustrated by a debtor's relation to his creditor.

3 Hence the previous incomplete literal translation should be filled out: "And dismiss Thou to us our offences even as we dismiss (offences) to those in our debt."

ἁμαρτάνω (compounded of α privative and μέρος, *i. e.*, without a share or part) which means (1°) "to miss the mark (to be without a share in the mark) with τοῦ σκοπου to miss the goal, or with τῆς ὁδοῦ, to miss the way; (2°) to err, be mistaken, to sin (even in the Septuagint). The noun ἁμαρτία consequently signifies *a missing:* (1°) an error, *i. e.*, of the understanding; (2°) a bad action, evil deed. In the New Testament it always has this ethical sense, though it may stand for (*a*) simply *a sinning*, whether by omission or commission, referring to the source of the act, *i. e.*, sin taken *subjectively;* or (*b*) for that which is done wrong, resultant sin, *i. e.*, the offense *objectively;* or (*c*) for sin *collectively*, whether it includes the sins of one or of many. Its use in the present verse in connection with ὀφείλων is noticeable; the fact insinuates that what the noun contains is not foreign to the verb's force. And in this connection the difference of various manuscripts is significant: in place of ἁμαρτίας, we read in some ὀφειλήματα (as in St. Matth.), in others παρα-πτώματα (*i. e.*, sins conceived of as fallings-down from an upright position, lapses), etc. In place of καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ("for even ourselves") we have ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ("even as we"), and πάντι ὀφείλοντι is represented by ταις ὀφειλέταις ἡμων. These discrepancies hint at various attempts to harmonize the verse in St. Luke with that in St. Matthew. Hence the next paragraph.

III.—*Do the two reports of our Lord's Utterance harmonize?*—After the above considerations, it is evident that they do. In each case *sin* is presented to us: in the first place under the aspect, literally speaking, of a debt; in the second, of a missing the mark or goal God has willed us to win. But in each case the meaning of one word has become confused with that of the other; the limits of the original strict first meanings have not been adhered to: ἁμαρτία does fit in with ὀφείλων. It is ever *sin*, which is the ὀφείλη (debt) in one case and the ἁμαρτία (missing) in the other. The thing spoken of is the same; the aspect of it expressed by each word did originally differ; but as the essence was the all important factor, it is not to be wondered at that the thing actually expressed came to be the prominent conception embodied in

each term and that thus their use as synonyms resulted. St. Matthew and St. Luke, therefore, express the same thought of our Lord, or, at most, complete one another.

IV. *The two English translations.*—(1°) "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." "Debt," in English, gives the primary meaning of ὀφείλημα; but it has hardly the second and larger sense of the Greek word (*viz.*, offense, sin), unless, at least, accompanied by a context. By itself it is not a word of double and distinct force like the Jewish *chob* (חוב); you do not find "debt" and "offense" or "trespass" compared in Crabb's book of English synonyms. In like manner "debtor" in the second member of the verse does not do justice to ὀφειλέτης. Of course it can have as wide a range of meaning, where there is a context to expose its force; hence in the parable of our Lord, already referred to (Matth. xviii, 24 ff.), it evidently includes all a man's relations to his Creator. When there is no context, however, its significance is limited; by itself "our debtors" does not mean "those guilty of all sorts of transgressions against us." 2° "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." "Trespass" comes nearer to the primary meaning of ἁμαρτία than "debt"; one may miss the mark or goal by running by it, *i. e.*, passing over it and so "trespassing" in its more radical sense. "Trespass" indeed may easily include, and often does include, "debt"; though technically "debts" represent rather omissions, while "trespasses" add to omissions the notion of commissions.

V. *The prayer in its ritualistic aspect.*—A ritual is intended to arrange the prayers and ceremonies of a religion for general use. Harmony is essential to a ritual; and hence in its development, efforts in the way of agreement constantly appear. The manuscriptal differences we have noted in the verse we are dealing with, are themselves evidences of this tendency to concord. This tendency also is strikingly shown by what has taken place in the preceding verse of the Lord's Prayer: "Give us this day our supersubstantial bread." St. Matthew's has, in the ritual

form of the petition yielded to St. Luke's "Give us this day our daily bread."[1] However, besides bringing about harmony in the forms of prayer, a ritual, also, arranges and words its prayers so as to express to the full the thoughts or doctrines these prayers give expression to; the sources of the religion it exposes, the scattered elements of its creed are worked over and made to complete or interpret one another. In such a composition, therefore, one must expect differences to appear between it and its sources; for what it expresses in one phrase may result from combining two, three, or more passages from the original documents, each of which passages, probably, adds its mite to the development of the fundamental thought involved. In our present verse there was need for just such a bit of work. The double meaning of ὀφείλημα must be brought out; it means not only "debt," but also offense" or "sin." No one may doubt this, for there is the parallel passage in Luke, where we have ἁμαρτία substituted for ὀφείλημα and explicitly connected with ὀφείλων. In a translation of either of these passages, of course you can give the bare first meaning of each word, and then by means of counter references and comments supply what is wanting. But all this is out of place in a prayer intended to express the conception as completed by such comparing and

1 However, there is a real difference between the case of this verse and the case of the verse which follows it. This latter verse has two different words in the Greek for "sins," *viz.*, ὀφειλήματα and ἁμαρτίαι. The former, on the contrary, has the same Greek term in Matthew and in Luke, *viz.*, ἐπιούσιον. This word is translated *super-substantial* in Matthew and *daily* in Luke by the Vulgate, followed, of course, by the Douay. The real difficulty is as to the meaning of the original term; St. Jerome translates it in the two ways noted—why?—who knows? In his time the prayer was already liturgical, and an answer should probably be sought in earlier and variant popular Latin forms of it. Origen testifies that ἐπιούσιον was not in use in ordinary speech, and t would seem to have been coined by the evangelists. "The form of the word admits of four meanings: (1) bread sufficient for the day now coming; (2) sufficient for the morrow; (3) sufficient for existence; (4) over and above material substance, or, as the Vulgate renders it, *panis super-substantialis* . . . It is not without some hesitation, in face of so general a concurrence of authority, that I find myself constrained to say that the last meaning seems to me the truest"—*Dean Plumptre.*

commenting. Now, as matter of fact, if you translate the Greek into "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," you must add explanatory notes. All commentators have felt this necessity. St. Augustine's whole homily upon the verse is an expansion of his words: "Debitores enim sumus non pecuniarum, sed peccatorum" (Serm. lvi. De Evang. Matth. vi, 7–13). Indeed, one reading of the petition, and a very early one, puts the two words "debts" and "sins" into the regular form. Optatus, the African bishop of the Fourth century, who wrote somewhere between A.D. 365 and 370, charges the Donatist bishops who were ordaining and giving remission of sin, and yet committing it themselves, with self-contradiction. He says: "Just after the very moments in which you impose hands and remit faults you turn to the altar, and cannot leave out the Lord's Prayer; you are obliged to say: "Our Father who art in heaven, forgive us our debts and sins."[1] However, just as this writer abbreviates the full form of the prayer for the purpose he had at that moment in view, so he may have added the word "peccata" to bring out more strongly the meaning all felt to be included in "debita." John Wyclif, in his turn, when treating of the verse, felt it necessary to comment "Forgeve vs oure dettis, that is our synnes, as we forgeven to houre dettouris, that is to men that have trespassed agenst vs."[2] Bearing in mind what has been said in the preceding paragraph, and adding, to it the considerations just dealt with, it seems clear that the form "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us" is *per se* better adapted to the requirements of a ritual than the more literal "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our

1 Etenim inter vicina momenta dum manus imponitis et delicta donatis, mox ad altare conversi, dominicam orationem praetermittere non potestis. Et utique dicitis: Pater noster, qui es in coelis, dimitte nobis debita et peccata nostra . . . De Schis. Don. Lib. ii. s xx. Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus* Compl. vol. xi, p. 975.

2 "The English Works of Wyclif. Hitherto Unprinted." Matthews (London, Eng. Tract. Soc., 1880).

debtors." At this point our inquiry may take a more historical turn.

VI. *When the word "trespass" was first used.*—In previous remarks upon "debt" and "trespass" we have treated of the words in their current significations. The more literal force of "trespass" as "a passing over" was, indeed, mentioned, but rather for the sake of showing it to be nearer in its composition to ἁμαρτία than "debt;" it was not intended to assume that "trespass" historically always possessed the broad ethical conception it at present carries with it.[1] However, from a time not long after its appearance in English it has had its broader meaning. Hence Wyclif in his day would use the the phrase "men that have trespassed against us" to make clearer the ethical meaning of "debtors;" and one need but consult a Concordance of the Bible to realize the early occurrence of the word "trespass" in the signifieation of moral wrong against the neighbor, or against God. Both words, by the way, "debt" as well as "trespass," came into English by way of the Normans; hence one could not have appeared in the first English, or, more correctly, Saxon or Angelo-Saxon versions of the Lord's Prayer. The appearance of our verse in these translations well merits attention; and a brie review of its changes from century to century enables us tc more accurately locate the appearance of the present phraseology.

In a gloss on the Evangelists written by Efrid, Bishop of Lindisfarne, about A. D. 700, the petition reads:

"And forgef us scyltha usra suae use forgefon scylgum usum."

In a manuscript of Saxon Homilies about the same date, it appears:

"And forlete us ure scylde swa swa ne ac forleten thaem the scyldigat with us."

1 Its earlier meaning was "to pass over the bounds of another's land, to enter unlawfully upon the land of another;" and in French it means this, and besides, "to pass the bounds of life"—*i. e.* to die; it does not signify to sin.

An English translation of the tenth century is:

"And forgyf us ure gyltas swa swa we forgifath urum gyltendum."[1] In this last version "gyltas" strikes one as familiar; in truth, put into our present tongue, we read: "And forgive us our guilts even as we forgive our guilters." This better known word "guilt" or "gyltas" is one in origin with the obscure "scyltha," "scylde," "scylgum" and "scyldigat," its earlier representatives. To realise this you need but turn to your large Dictionary and find the word "guilt;" you read: "Sax. *gylt*, a crime and a debt, connected with *gyldam* to pay, or it is from the root of Dutch and German *schuld*, Dan. *skyld*, a debt, fault, guilt. See *Shall, Should.*" For our present purpose there is no need to consult *should*, but *shall* will repay perusal: "Sax. *scealam*, *scylan*, to be obliged. It coincides in signification nearly with *ought*, it is a duty, it is necessary; D. *zal*, *zul;* G. *soll;* Su. *skola*, pret. *skulle;* Dan. *skal*, *skulle*, *skulde.* The German and Dutch have lost the palatal letter of the verb, but it appears in the derivative G. *schuld*, guilt, fault, culpability, debt; D. *schuld*, id.; Su. *skuld;* Dan. *skyld*, debt, fault, guilt, *skylder*, to owe; Sax. *scyld*, debt, offense; L. *scelus.* The literal sense is to hold, or to be held, hence, the sense of guilt, a being held, bound, or liable to justice and punishment. *In the Teutonic dialects 'schulden,' 'skyld' are used in the Lord's prayer, as 'forgive us our debts,' but neither 'debt' nor 'trespass' expresses the exact idea, which includes sin or crime, and liability to punishment.*"[2] And therefore did the old saxon of the eighth century more accurately express the Greek ἁμαρτίας and ὀφειλήματα and the Jewish *choboth* (חבות) than our form of to-day! What a pity the old "guilts" and "guilters" lost their place in the prayer.[3]

1 The preceding verse reads quaintly—"Urne daegwamlicam hlaf syle us to daeg"—*i. e.* "Our daily loaf give us to-day."

2 Webster's Unabrg. Dict. (1 84 8).

3 The first two forms are from the "Annotated Book of Common Prayer" —Blunt; and the third from "A Plain Account of The English Bible" p. 12. (Oxford, 1870).

Wyclif's version has already been presented; here is another of the same century (14th.):

"Oure ech day bred gef us to-day and forgene us oure dettes as we forgeneth to oure detoures."[1]

We now come to a version which cannot fail to particularly interest us Catholics. In 1878 the Early English Tract Society published at London "The Myroure of Oure Ladye," containing a devotional Treatise on Divine Service, with a Translation of the Offices used by the Sisters of The Brigittine Monastery of Sion at Isleworth, during the 15th and 16th centuries, edited from the Original Black Letter Text of 1530 A. D., with Introduction and Notes by John Henry Blunt. This community, we are told in the Introduction, existed at Isleworth on the banks of the Thames from the year 1415 until the Dissolution of the Monasteries, and was revived in its old quarters during the short reign of Queen Mary, and still exists as a distinctively English community at Lisbon. The "Mirror of Our Lady" consists of a "Rationale" of Divine Services in general, with a translation and explanation of the "Hours" and "Masses" of our Lady as they were used at Sion. There remains an imperfect manuscript of it, belonging to the 15th century, and there are a few printed copies, in a more or less imperfect condition, from the press of Richard Fawkes, printed in the year 1530. The manuscript was brought from the Cape of Good Hope and presented to the University of Aberdeen by Mr. Wm. Robertson, A.M., in April, 1828. It is a small quarto on paper (8 x 6 inches), containing 270 pages of writing (6 x 4 inches) in a hand which belongs sometime between A. D. 1460 and A. D. 1500; nearer probably, to the former, than to the latter, date. On the last leaf the writer has subscribed his name "R. Tailour;" and in a contemporary hand is added: "This booke belongyth to Syster Elysabeth Mouton." The book was composed between A. D. 1415, when the monastery was founded, and A. D. 1450. The object of the translation was to render the

1 Also from the "Annotated Book of Common Prayer."

service intelligible to those not able to read Latin. Vernacular Prymers (*i. e.* of prayers) of an earlier date are in existence, but the translations given in the "Mirror" are quite independent of them, and thus show forth the growing tendency, even in conventional houses, towards a vernacular service. In this work, on page 75, we have, verse by verse with suitable comment, first the Latin words, and then the translation of the Lord's prayer. Here appears the form:

"And forgyve us oure trespasses as we forgyve oure trespassoures."

Though this be not the first appearance of our word "trespass," it is surely one of the earlier ones. We find a like form in the Prymer of 1538:

"Gyve us this daye our daylye breade. And forgyve us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us."[1] It would be worth while to inquire how the word "trespass" came to be introduced into the form—since in French, as noted in a preceding foot-note, it has *not* the full ethical meaning it has in English, but the limits of this paper forbid the inquiry. This expression must have been the more popular one, and thus earned its way as the accepted form in the Book of Common Prayer. The compilers of that volume would be careful to introduce whatever they could of the prayers the people were wont to use, where there was no question of doctrinal difference involved between the new and old churches.[2] Notwithstanding this, it is evident that the words "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us" have a thoroughly Catholic origin, and that no Catholic need change them in favor of the

1 Also Book of Common Prayer and Maskell's Monumenta Ritualia, II, p. 239

2 It is never an easy matter to change general liturgies. Hence, for example, the Book of Psalms in the Vulgate remained almost unaltered by St. Jerome: the old forms and expressions were endeared to the faithful from their constant use of them. It is to be remembered that the Douay version was not published until 1609 A. D.; while the Lord's Prayer, at this time, was some centuries old—in its vernacular dress.

Douay version—"Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."

NOTE.—The question which occasioned this paper, was asked by a priest for a very practical purpose. In his parish reside several Catholic young ladies who teach in the public schools. In these the opening exercise is the recital of the Lord's prayer. To avoid friction it was agreed that Catholics might render this in their own way. Which was the proper Catholic form of the prayer: that given in their prayer-books or the form as it appeared in the Douay version?—these young ladies asked. The essay enables one to answer that the practical rule in such a necessity would be to follow the Douay version when reading the chapter in St. Matthew, wherein the prayer is contained; but to adapt the accepted and approved prayer-book form, when reciting our Saviour's blessed words as part of our Christain worship.

JOSEPH V. TRACY.

St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

THE "DEFENSOR VINCULI" IN MATRIMONIAL CASES.

THE general Decrees of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore prescribe (Tit. x, n. 304-307), that all contentions regarding the validity of the marriage bond, brought before the ecclesiastical tribunals in the United States are to be examined with due observance of the judicial formalities laid down in the *Instrnctio de Judiciis Ecclesiasticis circa Causas Matrimoniales*, issued by the S. Congr. de Propag. Fide in 1884. One of the most important functionaries in these trials is the "Defensor Vinculi," who, says the text of the Council, is to be an ecclesiastic, possessed of a knowledge of Canon Law, and without reproach (juris scientia pariter ac vitae probitate praeditus). Dr. Smith in his excellent book "The Marriage Process in the United States," points out the duties and rights of the marriage defender with great clearness. Nevertheless, there are points which need to be emphasized, and to which our attention has been

called by a paper in the last number of the *Analecta Ecclesiastica*, in which Mgr. Basilio Pompili, advocate of the Roman Curia, and Consultor of the Propaganda, deals with this subject in a manner which proves its practical importance. As we cannot hope to improve upon the correctness of the position which the learned author takes regarding this matter, we will be pardoned if we give his argument entire, omitting only the portion (introductory) referring to the reasons which induced Mgr. Pompili to discuss the subject in the Roman periodical. We have endeavored to make our translation as literal as the genius of the English language permits, in order to convey the true sense of the writer's important contention as to the requisite presence of a "Defensor Vinculi" in all matrimonial cases, without whose presence, and perfect liberty of action, all the proceedings of the trial become null and void, at least so far as they determine a judicial decision.

"It is well known," writes Mgr. Pomili, "that the office of advocate, or defender of the sacrament in matrimonial cases, owes its origin to Benedict the XIV, who, in his celebrated Constitution *Dei Miseratione*, gives the methods and rules to be observed in these trials."

This most wise Pontiff grieved that the marriage bond, which of its nature is indissoluble, was, in certain ecclesiastical courts or tribunals, infringed on by hasty and indiscreet judges, who, without due consideration, declared the marriage contract null, and gave the parties liberty to enter into new alliances. He, therefore, decreed and commanded that the Ordinary of each diocese should select, and preferably from among the clergy, a person of known skill in the law and of excellent character, who should be styled the defender of the matrimonial bond (matrimoniorum defensor).

This was proper; for since it is an inviolable rule, both in civil and canon law, that no one shall be condemned without a defense, it was most becoming that the Sacrament of Matrimony, concerning which Christ commanded: *what therefore God joined together, let no man put asunder*,

should have a constituted advocate to see that its rights were not infringed upon.

The Pontiff desired that this advocate, or *defensor matrimonii*, should be present at all judicial trials of matrimonial cases that involved the question of the *validity*, or *nullity*, of the Sacrament. Hence, though the nullity of a marriage be certain and evident, his presence is nevertheless necessary; as the Sacred Congregation of the Council held in an answer given to the Bishop of Sonora, August 26, 1848, not to mention similar decisions. This opinion is strengthened by a recent decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, given June 3, 1889, by which permission was granted, in certain cases where the nullity of the marriage is evident, namely, "When the question concerns the impediment *cultus disparitas*, and the evidence is clear that one of the parties was baptized and the other was not; when the case regards the impediment *ligaminis*, and it is certain that the first lawful consort is still living; when the question turns on *relationship* either from *consanguinity* or *affinity*, *ex copula licita*, or on spiritual relationship, or, finally, on the impediment of clandestinity, in places where the Tridentine decree *Tametsi* has been published or has long been observed as such, in these cases permission was granted to the Ordinaries to declare the marriages null, without the formalities prescribed in the Apostolic Constitution *Dei Miseratione*, providing always the existence of the impediment and its non-dispensation by the Church, were proven by clear and well attested evidence; nevertheless, the decree added, the trial is to be carried on, "*with the assistance of the defender of the marriage tie*, without need of a second decision"—"cum interventu tamen defensoris vinculi matrimonialis, quin opus sit secunda sententia."

But theologians and canonists are greatly at variance as to whether the presence of the *defensor vinculi* is equally necessary when there is question of a dispensation in the case of a marriage *ratum et non consummatum*. According to the rigid interpretation of the Benedictine Constitution, it would appear that his presence is not necessary, as the

validity of the Sacrament, in such cases, is not in dispute. But it must be confessed that this opinion is against the ordinary procedure of the Curia. For not only is the Sacred Congregation of the Council accustomed to have the *defensor matrimonii* present when it tries such cases, but it also directs that if anything is done in such cases in episcopal tribunals without the assistance of the advocate of the matrimonial bond, *the acts of the trial must first be validated*, and then recourse be had to the Pope for the dispensation sought for. The *defensor matrimonii* is not required in cases of separation from bed and board (*quoad torum et habitationem*), or where there is question of the validity of a betrothal (sponsalia), or of freedom from the bond of marriage (*status liber*), as in the case of uncertainty of the death of a husband or wife—in which latter case the instruction of the Holy Office, given in the year 1868, is to be followed.

According to the decrees of Benedict XIV, a *defensor matrimonii* should be appointed in every Curia, and should exercise his office for every case tried before that tribunal. Nevertheless, the Sacred Congregation usually does not object to the custom in vogue in many places, of designating an advocate for each particular case—"*toties* quoties pro particulari casu." This practice may have its foundation in the words of the Constitution, which give bishops the power to suspend, or remove, the *defensor matrimonii*, for just cause and to appoint another suitable advocate in his stead. Notwithstanding, it would be well to make the appointment a permanent one; not only because the letter of the law requires it to be such, but also because experience and familiarity with forensic usages will greatly aid the advocate in carrying out his duty properly.

Whether he be appointed for all cases or merely for a particular one, the *defensor matrimonii* must be sworn for each case he is engaged in. The Constitution cited above says, § 7: "When appointed to this office, the *defensor matrimonii* must take oath that he will rightly perform the duties thereof, and in every case in which he appears, *he*

shall likewise take oath that he will defend the validity of the marriage."

The qualifications necessary for an advocate are two: Proper knowlege of the law, and probity of life; of both of which qualifications the bishop is the judge. If possible, the choice should be made from among the clergy, but if suitable clerics are not to be had, it is not forbidden to choose a layman.

The Pontiff continues: "Such an advocate should be considered as necessary to the validity and integrity of the trial; he must always be present at the trial, whether only one of the parties is seeking to have the marriage set aside, or whether both parties come into court, one seeking to have the marriage sustained, the other to have it set aside. . . . Whatever is done at the trial without *his being properly cited or notified*, we declare to be *null and void, and we wish such acts to be considered just as null and void and valueless*, precisely as if the party whose interest it is to be cited were not cited and notified, and whose citation and notification, according to the rules of the laws and the canons, are necessary for the validity of the trial." These words are so clear as to need no comment. The advocate, or *defensor vinculi*, must be cited "to be present at all sessions, to render their acts valid." Instructio S. C. Concilii Aug. 22, 1840. Hence if he is not cited, *even only once*, the acts are *ipso facto* null and void. It is disputed, whether the acts of a session would be null, were the advocate absent from that session, although he had always been properly cited to appear. Those who answer negatively, base their opinion both on the words of the Constitution, which they say, "*utpote in re odiosa*," should be interpreted strictly, and also on the words of the Instruction of the Congregation of the Holy Office, which was given to the Eastern Bishops, June 20th, 1883, in these terms: "If, owing to peculiar circumstances, the *defensor matrimonii* cannot be present at each session, the acts of the sessions must be given to him after the process is finished, so that he may note down whatever observations he thinks necessary for the proper defense

of the validity of the Sacrament." Though these words are of great weight, they do not seem altogether decisive; for in the same Constitution we are warned that: "The *defensor matrimonii* is to be considered *essential to make the trial valid and complete, and that he must be always present in the court.*" These words point out not only the obligation the *defensor* is under of punctual assistance at the court, in order to fulfill the duty intrusted to him, but they may be taken also to mean, that otherwise the trial will not be valid and complete. In such a view, the instruction cited above from the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, will be taken as pointing an exception, or as a concession granted to certain persons because of their peculiar circumstances, and applicable to those alone to whom the same instruction was directed.

This fact is brought out by the practice of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. To quote from one of many examples, this Congregation, on April 17, 1869, confirmed in the following words a decision of the Curia declaring a certain marriage null: "*The sentence is confirmed, with the assent of the Holy Father, when the defect arising from the absence of the defensor matrimonii* at the trial of the man shall have been remedied."[1]

At all events, the greatest care should be taken, as far as possible, to have the defender of the Sacrament ("*vindex Sacramenti*") present at every session; the more so because in the Benedictine Constitution, the permission is given to the bishop "to suspend or remove, for just cause, the person he has chosen as advocate (*defensor mat.*), and to substitute another in his stead; which he can also do whenever the regular advocate is legitimately prevented from being present."

Nor is the custom of certain Curias reprobated of naming another suitable cleric as a substitute, who whenever he fills the place of the regular advocate will take the prescribed oath.

1 Praevia sanatione defectus *adsistentiae defensoris* ex officio examini viri, facto verbo cum SSmo. sententiam esse confirmandam.

The duties of the *defensor matrimonii*, or advocate, are thus set forth by Benedict XIV: "He is to be cited to every session of the court, he is to be present at the examination of the witnesses, he is to defend the validity of the Sacrament both by voice and pen ('voce et scriptis'), and he is to bring forward whatever he deems necessary to sustain the marriage."

These duties are explained in the afore-mentioned instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, August 22, 1840. For it is decreed that to him belongs the right of preparing the questions to be asked the parties to the suit, as well as the witnesses, and to give these questions closed and sealed to the chancellor, to be opened only by the judge and in the course of the trial. He may also add during the trial any other questions which may be suggested by the testimony as likely to bring out the true state of the case, either by throwing light on the answers already given, or by making clear new circumstances that may be developed by the testimony. And although most excellent witnesses have been examined at his request, he will also cite and examine others if he judge from the course of the trial that they too have some knowledge of the affair. Likewise, it is his duty to see that witnesses living at a distance, and who cannot, therefore, be present at the trial, be interrogated by the bishop of the place at which they are staying, the advocate (*defensor mat.*) sending, closed and under seal, the questions to be asked them. It is to be noted in passing, that when witnesses are examined by delegation in another Curia the presence of a suitable person who will act for the *defensor vinculi* is necessary, and he also must be sworn, pledging himself to fulfill the office of Defensor in all those things indicated in the cited Instruction and several times affirmed by the Sacred Congregation, and recently in the case of Burdigalen., 18 Martii, 1893. In order that every facility may be afforded the *Defensor*, enabling him to safeguard the marriage bond, the acts of the processes must be made known to him before they are published; his remonstrances must always be received, and should he demand it, the court must be re-

opened to give him opportunity to complete his arguments and to produce them ("*ut ea perficiat et exhibeat*").

When he thinks there is no more proof to be elicited, the judge may close the trial, and publish its acts; but even after this publication, the right is reserved to the advocate of the Sacrament to seek new evidence or proof. Moreover, the statements or points of defence of the parties against the validity of the marriage contract must be given to the defender of the bond, so that he may be enabled to study and refute the allegations: and only when he thinks that no other proof is to be adduced, can the judge give the verdict. If the verdict be that the marriage is null, "the advocate appeals *ex-officio* to a higher court."

In a second or further appeal the same rules hold good in regard to the intervention of the *defensor*. After two decisions against the validity of the marriage, he may abstain from further appeal, if in conscience he judge the sentence to be a fair one. Lastly, we should bear in mind that the Sacred Congregations adhere strictly to these rules, nor do they ever depart from them except for weighty reasons. If there be grave reasons for it, the Sacred Congregation of the Council permits a process to go on, *under the condition that the essential parts of the Benedictine Constitution be observed;* but there seems to be no instance of permission being given to dispense with the presence of the *Defensor*. There are some rare instances in which the acts of a trial have been validated that were carried on without the presence of the *defensor vinculi*, and therefore were null and void: as in decrees rendered in the following cases: Lantandrien. seu Cubana 26 Aprilis et 30 Augusti, 1788; in Albinganen. 12 Septembris 1801; in Virgilien. 25 Maii et 24 Augusti, 1844; in Cadicen. 24 Januarii, 1857; in Dublinen. 16 Junii, 1866, et novissime in Ayacuquen. 21 Maii 1892.

For such a validation, it is assumed to be necessary that the concession is in all respects, equitable and opportune. Hence, it is necessary that the matter should be evident, all danger of collusion on the part of the consorts, or of false testimony on part of the witnesses being wholly removed; that

there should be no suspicion of any contempt for canonical law, or of deception of the judges; and that owing to the peculiar circumstances both of persons and places, a new hearing is next to impossible.

But there is a far larger number of cases in which, on account of this defect, the Sanatio has been refused.

Recently, May 27, 1893, the Archbishop of Ravenna, because of many and grave reasons, asked for revalidation of a process which had been carried on without the presence of the *defensor matrimonii*, and which was also informal in other respects, but although the consultors appointed in the case by the Sacred Congregation, recommended that the concession asked for be granted, because of the grave reasons given by the Archbishop, and because the process was substantially complete, yet the Congregation ordered that a new process should be instituted and carried out according to the regular forms of the law, and especially according to the prescriptions of the Benedictine Constitution. In what has been said in reference to this matter, I do not pretend to give anything new to those who are acquainted with canon law, but I wish only to show how carefully the Church has guarded the indissolubility of marriage, and what care, therefore, should be exercised in diocesan Curias, to carry out to the very letter the prescriptions of canon law governing matrimonial cases.

THE LIBRARY OF A PRIEST.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY.

AS regards the selection of philosophical works of one's private library little need be said by way of introduction. Indeed the choice of books in this department is a thing which can hardly be left to the judgment of another. For, it must depend upon methods of private study which have been followed, and upon the character of the special treatises in which a more particular interest has been taken.

Knowing this, we have very hesitatingly ventured to indicate about one hundred volumes, of which a few may recommend themselves for the filling out of any plan which the judgment of individual students has traced.

We have endeavored to carry out the idea of the complete course pursued in the Seminary. The first part of our sketch contains simply the names of notable works in philosophy ; in the second part are given brief comments upon the merits of such as seem to require special mention. To this we add a few suggestive remarks on the "History of Philosophy," and a short list of works for "Special and Supplementary Reading."

LIBERATORE: *Institutiones Philosophicae*, 3 vols. with Ethics; *Composto Umano*, 1 vol.; *Conoscenza Intellettuale*, 1 vol.

TONGIORGI: *Institutiones Philosophicae*, 3 vols. without Ethics.

ZIGLIARA (Card.): *Summa Philosophica*, 3 vols. with Ethics.

SAN SEVERINO: *Philosophia Christiana*, 3 vols. (summary of a more extensive work).

LA HOUSSE: *Praelectiones Metaphysicae*, 3 vols. without Ethics.

VAN DER AA: *Praelectiones Philosophiae Scholasticae*, 5 vols. with Ethics and a history of Philosophy.

MENDIVE: *Institutiones Philosophiae Scholasticae*, 3 vols. with Ethics.

PALMIERI: *Institutiones Philosophicae*, 3 vols.

SCHIFFINI, Sanctus: *Principia Philosophica ad mentem Aquinatis*, 1 vol.; *Disputationes Metaphysicae specialis*, 2 vols.

SCHIFFINI, Blasius: *Logica*, 1 vol.

URRABURU: *Logica*, *Ontologia*, *Cosmologia*, 3 large vols. 8vo.

DE SAN: *Institutiones Metaphysicae Specialis*, *Cosmologia*, 1 vol.

CORNOLDI: *Institutiones Philosophiae Speculativae*, 1 vol.

PESCH: *Institutiones Logicales*, 3 vols.; *Institutiones Philosophiae Naturalis*, 1 vol.

HAAN: *Philosophia Naturalis*, 1 vol.

FRICK: *Logica*, 1 vol.; *Ontologia*, 1 vol.

RUSSO: *Summa Philosophica*, 1 vol.; *De Philosophia Morali Praelectiones*, 1 vol.

HONTHEIM: *Institutiones Theodicaeae*, 1 vol.

FERRETTI: *Institutiones Philosophiae Moralis*, 3 vols.

MEYER: *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*, 1 vol. (the second volume is about to be published).

CATHREIN: *Philosophia Moralis*, 1 vol.; *Moral Philosophie*, 2 vols. (German); *Socialism*, 1 vol. (an English translation of a portion of the preceding work).

MING: *Data of Modern Ethics*, 1 vol.

CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY: Stonyhurst Series, 7 vols., *viz*:—

Logic: Clarke;

First Principles of Knowledge: Rickaby, John;

General Metaphysics: Rickaby, John;

Psychology: Maher;

Natural Theology: Boedder;

Moral Philosophy: Rickaby, Joseph;

Political Economy: Devas.

HARPER: *The Metaphysics of the School*, 3 vols.

BALMES: *Fundamental Philosophy*, 2 vols.

DE CONCILIO: *The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy*, 1 vol.

COPPPENS: *Logic and Mental Philosophy*, 1 vol.

HILL: *Elements of Philosophy*, 1 vol. (logic and ontology); *Moral Philosophy*, 1 vol.

POLAND: *The Laws of Thought*, 1 vol.; *Fundamental Ethics*, 1 vol.

REEB: *Thesaurus Philosophorum*, 1 vol., (a small pocket dictionary of philosophical distinctions and axioms).

MIVART: *Philosophical Catechism*, 47 small pages.

JOUIN: *Compendium Logicae et Metaphysicae*, 1 vol.; *Elementa Philosophiae Moralis*, 1 vol.

Some brief treatises have been introduced into the list for

the sake of completeness. Whatever special usefulness they may have separately, can be readily discovered by cursory examination.

We do not believe it would be wise to attempt to pass sentence upon the relative merits of the more voluminous writers. Such sentence could not be taken as definitive, but only as the expression of one opinion amongst many; and it could therefore be of little practical value. A word or two, however, about some of the writers or their works, may perhaps not be regarded as pedagogical.

To Liberatore, more than to any other individual in the nineteenth century, is due the honor of having put our philosophical studies upon the solid basis upon which they stand to-day. In the work which he undertook, namely, that of reinstating the philosophy of St. Thomas, he was powerfully seconded by San Severino and Zigliara. Tongiorgi followed. He died about thirty years ago, at the age of thirty-two or thirty-three. His work was a masterly feat, and with his limpid depths he might have gained absolute and more lasting hold in the schools, had it not been for some unfortunate theories which he clung to in the special metaphysics. Still, he is read constantly, and writers of note have not hesitated to borrow from him without giving him credit.

Zigliara is deep, incisive—a true metaphysician, whom Leo XIII recognized and appointed Praefectus Studiorum of the Catholic Universities.

San Severino, working in line with Liberatore, gives an extended and lucid exposition of the philosophy of St. Thomas, and a complete refutation of the philosophical errors of ancient and modern times.

LaHousse and Van der Aa touch all the questions of the day. LaHousse is valuable as presenting in full the scholastic method of disputation. Van der Aa is compact and constructive, building securely upon well laid foundations.

Harper's "Metaphysics of the School" is held by some to be the most important work on pure metaphysics written during this century.

Mendive is clear, orderly and always mindful of his audience.

In the "Cosmologia" of Urraburu and De San and the "Philosophia Naturalis" of Haan and Pesch we have an exhaustive treatment of the metaphysics of matter, and of all the subjects that are usually brought under Cosmology.

The "Stonyhurst Series," the only complete course of philosophy in the English language, is new, fresh and "up to date." Though it contains no separate treatise on Cosmology, nearly all the questions of Cosmology are touched upon in the Psychology and Natural Theology.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

We have no complete and absolutely reliable History of Philosophy written originally in English. One volume only, of the valuable work of Stoeckl has been translated into English. It is thoroughly reliable.

There is another translation, "Epitome of the History of Philosophy" (Harper's Family Library, 2 vols. small 12mo.). It was published originally about forty years ago in French, and was adopted by the University of France. It was translated by Professor Henry, who made some additions, and the translation was issued in two small volumes of the Family Library in 1856. It is the best complete book of the kind in English that we can at present call to mind. It is clear and brief, and is Christian in tone. Many pretentious works have since been published in English as Histories of Philosophy; but, whether translations or original contributions, they are all occupied chiefly in a vain endeavor to draw light from the chaos that goes by the name of "modern philosophy."

SPECIAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY READING.

MIVART: *Truth*, 1 vol.; *Lessons from Nature*, 1 vol.; *Genesis of Species*, 1 vol.

BALMES: *Criterion*, 1 vol.

HUGHES: *Principles of Anthropology and Biology*, 1 vol.

DAWSON: *Story of the Earth and Man*, 1 vol.

WAINWRIGHT: *Scientific Sophisms*, 1 vol.

NEWMAN: *Grammar of Assent*, 1 vol.

KLEUTGEN: *Philosophie der Vorzeit*, (French translation: "*Philosophie Scholastique*").

LIBERATORE: *Conoscenza Intellettuale*, 1 vol. (French translation "*De la Connaissance Intellectuelle*"); *Composto Umano*, 1 vol. (French translation "*Du Composé Humain*".)

CLARKE: *Existence of God*, (a dialogue; 12mo, paper).

RONAYNE: *God Knowable and Known*, 1 vol.

THEIN: *Christian Anthropology*, 1 vol.

WILLIAM POLAND, S.J.

St. Louis University.

ANALECTA.

LITTERAE S. P. LEONIS PP. XIII.

DE UNIVERSITATE WASHINGTONIENSI.

Dilecto filio nostro Iacobo Tit. S. Mariae Transtiberinae S. R. E. Presbytero Cardinali Gibbons Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi

LEO PP. XIII.

Dilecte Fili Noster, salutem et Apostolicam benedictionem. Benevolentiae testandae curaeque Nostrae erga Universitatem istam studiorum catholicam, rursus oblata est causa, nuncio abs te gratissimo accepto. Eam scilicet, quam Nosmetipsi autoritate apostolica constituendum curavimus legitimoque auximus iure, magnopere laetamur, non modo ubertate bonorum fructuum sese Nobis per sexennium probasse, verum etiam ad ampliora coepta pleno gradu procedere. Huiusmodi Nos incrementa sperare significavimus non ita pridem, quum te ceterosque tecum Episcopos allocuti per epistolam sumus. Jamque ex alacritate vestra et piorum liberalitate fieri compertum est, ut octobri proximo nova doctrinarum magisteria in eodem Lyceo dedicentur; quae adolescentibus clericis utilitates maiores pariant et laicis quoque non mediocriter proficiant ad studia cultiora. Haec ipsa studia recte consuluistis ut Facultate contineantur philosophica: eàque tamen instructa et ornata variis adiutricibus disciplinis, quae fusius traditae atque eruditius, vel lumen veritati praebeant explorandae decusque exploratae addant, vel eamin opinione hominum faciant usuque fructuosiorem. Nobili autem proposito consentaneum exitum pollicentur nomina magistrorum egregia qui ad id muneris sunt delecti; eo praesertim quod deliberatum omnino habeant Thomae sancti Aquinatis certissimam philosophandi rationem, secundum praescripta Nostra, religiose persequi ducem. Quarum rerum perspecta excellentia, non poterat sane eisdem coeptis comprobatio deesse atoque auspicia huiusce Apostolicae Sedis, quae honestissima quaeque studia pro merito laudare omnique ope provehere perpetuo

consuevit. Votis igitur Nostris, Lyceum istud magnum eo amplius ex facta accessione praestet, vigeat, floreat, in religionis pariter civitatisque praesidium et ornamentum. Ad ipsom catholica juventutis collegia alumnos mittere studeant acrioris ingenii et spei laetioris; in eo autem sanctae unitatis vincula inter catholicos obstringantur, perutili exemplo; ex eoque, tamquam ex communi fonte, eiusdem doctrinae et actionis electa vis late dimanet influatque in animos saluberrima.

Interea tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, unaque Archiepiscopis et Episcopis, quorum in tutela Univertatis ipsa est, item iis, quorum beneficentia munifica alitur et augetur, Doctoribus atque alumnis nova curricula inituris, ceterisque omnibus Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XXIX iunii anno MDCCCVC, Pontificatus Nostri decimo octavo.

LEO PP. XIII.

DE ELEVATIONE FESTI ANNUNCIATIONIS B. V. MARIAE AD PRIMAM CLASSEM.

DECRETUM.

Urbis et Orbis.

Iure sane ac merito Festum B. Mariae Virginis, Deiparae ab antiquissimis temporibus, institutum, et penes Latinam Ecclesiam et Graecam pari solemnitate celebratum est: siquidem Dominicae Incarnationis Mysterium tanquam ceterorum fundamentum Sacra Liturgia profitetur. Hinc Apostolicae Sedi supplicia vota haud semel porrecta sunt, ut Festum ipsum Annuntiationis B. M. V. ad maximum ritum in Universa Ecclesia eveheretur. Itaque Sacra Rituum Congregatio in peculiari Coetu, pro nova Decretorum authentica Collectione evulganda, ad Vaticanum subsignata die habito, omnibus mature perpensis, rescribendum censuit: Festum Annuntiationis B. M. V. die 25 Martii occurrens, in universa Ecclesia ritu duplici primae classis amodo recolendum esse, cum omnibus iuribus celebriorum festorum propriis etsi Octava carens ob temporis quadragesimalis rationem. Ceterum, quotiescumque vel Feria VI. in Parasceve, vel Sabbato Sancto hoc Festum impediatur, toties Feria II. post Dominicam in Albis, tanquam in sede propria, ut antea, reponatur; in qua integra cum solemnitate ac feriatione et sine octava, prouti die 25 Martii, celebrabitur.

Quando vero illius tantummodo impediatur Officium, ad enuntiatam pariter Feriam II. amandetur, ac nonnisi Festo primario eiusdem ritus occurrente valeat impediri: quo in casu, in sequentem diem pariter non impeditam transferatur.—Die 23 Aprilis 1895.

Facta postmodum Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Praefectum de hisce omnibus relatione; Sanctitas Sua sententiam eiusdem S. Congregationis ratam habere et confirmare dignata est, Die 27 Maii, eodem anno.

L. ✠ S. CAIETANUS, *Card.*, ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*
ALOISIUS TRIPEPI, *S. R. C. Secretarius.*

EX S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII.

DISPENSATIO AB IRREGULARITATE.

(*Per Summaria precum.*)

Ioannes Kehren, Dioecesis, Coloniensis, in praesentiarum in gymnasio Kempensi litterarum studiis vacans, pio flagrat desiderio clericali militiae nomen dandi a qua tamen reppellitur ex gravi defectu manus sinistrae male formatae. Unde supplicem dedit libellum ad Beatissimum Patrem quo sospite laetamur, ut ab huiusmodi defectu irregularitatis benigne dispensaretur.

Eminentissimus Coloniensis Archiepiscopus huius preces enixius ita commendat:

"Omnes quidem Missae caeremonias orator ad amussim nequit peragere. Attamen cum R. D. Feltem, iam theologiae in universitate Bonnensi professor R. D. Ferwelp, professor religionisque in gymnasio Kempensi praeceptor, qui eum instituit, R. D. Kerp, vicarius ad S. Mauritium huius Coloniensis civitatis, qui oratorem eiusque familiam intimius novit, eum uno ore eximiis animi ingeniique dotibus asserunt pollere eumque optimo cum successu studiis testentur incumbere, illibatisque moribus et pietate insignem praedicent merito proinde sperandum sit eum, egregium evasurum esse sacerdotem, quamvis propter deformitatem manus in cura animarum vix adhibendus sit, preces oratoris Smo Dno hinc commendo."

Interim, de more, exquisivi ab Archiepiscopo votum et peritiam Caeremoniarum magistri; qui, diligenter peracto examine, haec refert: "Ioannes Kehren manum sinistram habet male formatam

inde a nativitate. Solus pollex est bene formatus ; caeteri quatuor digiti concreti sunt et membrana quadam inter se iuncti ; sunt insuper minores quam dexterae digiti, ita ut medietatem eorum non multo superant. Molles sunt et debiles ut digiti infantis. Etiam pollex et reliqua sinistrae manus pars minor est, quam pollex et cetera pars manus dexterae.

"Tali sinistrae manus deformitate orator impeditur, *quominus indicem a ceteris tribus digitis seiungat*, ita ut sequentes S. Sacrificii Caeremonias rite et secundum rubricas peragere nequeat.

"Post consecrationem hostiae ex praecepto Rubricarum—Sacerdos deinceps pollices et indices non disiungit, nisi quando hostiam consecratam tangere vel tractare debet, usque ad ablutionem digitorum post Communionem.—

"Quod rubricarum praeceptum quoad manum sinistram orator observare nequit :

(1) *immediate ante consecrationem calicis.*

"Sacerdos ambabus manibus (sc. pollice et indice iuncto) calicem iuxta nodum infra cuppam accipiens et aliquantulum elevans ac statim deponens.—(Rubrica).

"Orator manum sinistram aperit, pollicem a ceteris digitis disiungit, et calicem inter policem et manum (sc. inter pollicis latus ulnare et metacarpi latus radiale) accipit modo satis firmo et securo. *Nodum* manu sinistra clausa et pollice ac indice iuncto circumdare et tenere non potuit, quia digiti nimis breves sunt.

"(2) *ante orationem dominicam.*

"—Sacerdos tenet (sc. pollice et indice) manu sinistra calicem infra cuppam et elevat eum aliquantulum dicens : omnis honor et gloria. (Rubrica).

"Orator seiungit pollicem sinistrae manus a caeteris digitis et calicem tenet ut supra intra pollicem et metacarpum.

"(3) *ad Sumptionem hostiae maxima oritur difficultas.*

"—Sacerdos dextera manu accipit ambas partes hostiae et collocat inter pollicem et indicem sinistrae manus, quibus patenam inter eumdem indicem et medios digitos supponit et eadem manu sinistra tenet partes huiumodi super patenam inter pectus et calicem.—(Rubrica).

"Orator patenam intra indicem et medium digitum interponere *omnino nequit*, quia index cum reliquis digitis prorsus concretus et coniunctus est.

"Patenam tenet orator tali modo, ut ipsam inter pollicis latus ulnare et metacarpi latus radiale collocet, potest etiam, dum pate-

am sic tenet, ambas hostiae partes superpositas simul inter pollicem et indicem tenere, ita tamen, ut supra patenae marginem prostent.

"(4) *In distributione SS. Communionis infra missam et in purificatione Ciborii eadem oritur difficultas.* Orator disiungit pollicem ab indice, ut calicem teneat, vel ciborium.

"Experimento igitur compertum est, oratorem *cunctas* S. Sacrificii caeremonias *rite* et *secundum rubricas* peragere *non* valere. Quodsi a stricta rubricarum observatione dispensari possit, fatendum videtur, possibilitatem sacrificii offerendi adesse.

"Curationem vero deformitatis, qua orator laboret, separationem scilicet indicis a ceteris tribus digitis operatione chirurgica, in ea qua nunc orator versatur aetate, fieri posse, medici negant.

Observandum adhuc videtur, oratorem, si dispensatione obtenta ad sacrum presbyteratus ordinem promovendus foret; nec *tactum hostiae, patenae et calicis modo a rubricis praescripto perficere posse.*

"Episcopus tradit cuilibet ordinando calicem cum vino et aqua et patenam superpositam cum hostia et ipsi illam accipiunt inter indices et medios digitos, et cuppam calicis et palmam simul tangunt. —(Rubrica).

"Orator tantum manu dextra cuppam calicis et patenam *simul* tangere potest; sinistra vero *solam patenam* cum hostia, quin simul tangat calicem."

At dispensationi plura obstare videntur. Cum primis in ipsa S. Ordinis susceptione s. caeremoniis Orator satisfacere non valet quia nec "*tactum hostiae, patenae et calicis modo a rubricis praescripto perficere*" posse.

Sacra facturus vero Ioannes non valeret infra missam fidelibus Sacram communionem administrare quod praetermittere est ab Ecclesiae spiritu apprime alienum, uti docet Trid. Concil. *Sess.* 13 *c.* 6.

Praeterea in ipso Veteri Testamento ne altari inservirent, maximo studio arcebantur qui notabili corporis defectu laborabant. Eo magis hoc servari debuit in Novo Testamento: quare defectus irregularitatum in ipsa Canonum Apostolicorum collectione reperiuntur sedulo constituti. Postea irregularitatis casus taxative et rigide fuerunt determinati adeo ut dispensatum fuerit tantum pro iam promotis ad Ordines ne "*afflictio afflicto adderetur.*" Nihilominus in cap. II *De clerico aegrotante* missae celebratio presbytero inter-

dicitur cui duo digiti cum medietate palmae a praedone fuerant abscissi, Et S. O. V. in *Burgen. die* 24 *Ianuarii* 1864 dispensationem denegavit cuidam Ioachim De Zayas qui ob adustionem tendines pollicis et indicis dexterae manus contractos habebat, quique dimidia tantum parte phalangis utriusque digiti carebat, quamvis magistri caeremoniarum favorabile votum et Cardinalis Archiepiscopi commendatio precibus accederet.

Sed contra potius benignitati indulgendum esse suadent non parvi ponderis rationes. Cum primis admodum commendati mores Oratoris, eius ingenium et Sacerdotum penuria Diocesis Coloniensis, quam testantur spectatissimi viri, animum sane movent ad dispensationem elargiendam.

Hanc non videtur omnino prohibere defectus sinistrae manus quo laborat orator Ioannes. Nam in ipsa ordinis susceptione, si non potest ponere sacrorum instrumentorum tactum simultaneum a Rubricis requisitum, in hoc habetur accidentalis defectus qui per tactum successivum plene sanari posset.

Pro dispensatione vero ab huiusmodi defectu in celebratione Missae, abundant S. O. V. exempla quibus benignitate vigor canonum fuit temperatus. Sane in *Pampilonen. diei 31 Martii 1860* gratia concessa fuit clerico ut manu laeva uteretur in sacris Missae caeremoniis quia dextera manu se crucis signo munire nec calicem ori admovere valebat.

Ita in *Cebhaluden. diei 16 Iunii 1866* dispensatum fuit cum clerico Josepho Gianni laevae manus pollice carente et recentius in *Novarien. die* 27 *Iunii 1891* quamvis Oratori dexterae manus pollici una phalanx ac indici duae deessent phalanges ; in *Comaclen. diei 27 Februarii 1864* favorabile obtinuit rescriptum quidam Fogli, qui "anchilosi perfecta in genu dextero laborans (ita in eodem folio) non potest illud usque ad terram flectere sed mediam tantum, ut ita dicam, genuflexionem commode exequitur. Non secus *Ausculana diei 20 Februarii 1808*," etc.

Quare.

Quibus mature perpensis perpensis, Sacra Congregatio die 25 Maii 1895 rescripsit : "*Arbitrio et conscientiae Emi Archiepiscopi, dummodo vera adsit Ecclesiae necessitas, facto verbo cum Sanctissimo.*"

II.

DISPENSATIO MATRIMONII.

Sufficienter probata mulieris impotentia facile conceditur dispensatio super matrimonio rato et non consummato.

Lutetiae Parisiorum in Ecclesia vulgo "Notre Dame de Lorette" die 21 Aprilis 1890 legitimum contraxerunt matrimonium Robertus P. 28 annos natus et Camilla J. annorum undeviginti. At huiusmodi coniugium, quod fausto omine videbatur celebratum, non felicem habuit exitum. Etenim, nuptiali peregrinatione perdurante, coniuges maritale opus sunt aggressi, sed frustra, ut ipsi affirmant, quia mulier afficiebatur morbo vulgo *vaginismo*, ita ut ex viri contactu vaginae os magno cum dolore contraheretur, et violenta insuper nervorum contractio omnia eius membra pervaderet. Consuluerunt plures medicos, at remedia salutaris nihil profuisse testantur sponsi, nec unquam interea maritalem perficere copulam potuisse. Tunc Camilla operationi chirurgicae mense Iunii anno 1891 se subiecit, sed frustra videtur, si coniugibus fides adhibenda sit iurantibus posthac pluries copulam pertentasse, sed incassum.

Hinc dissensiones inter eos ortae sunt, quapropter Robertus, mense Augusti anni 1893, vitae communionem abrupit. Camilla apud saecularem iudicem marito separationis actionum intentavit, allegans graves iniurias ac saevitias ; at, civili iudicio interim suspenso, Robertus supplicem porrexit libellum ad Summum Pontificem, ut dispensationem super matrimonio rato et non consummato obtineret. Rescriptum illico fuit Emo Archiepiscopo, ut processum conficere curaret "super asserta inconsummatione matrimonii et causis dispensationis, servata forma, etc., et cum facultate subdelegandi." Tum ibi, tribunali rite constituto, coniuges legitime citati et iurati examini subiecti fuere. Excussi postea sunt testes septimae manus, tam ex latere viri, quam ex latere mulieris. Demum duobus medicis, speciali facta instructione, commissa est corporalis mulieris inspectio, non eum in finem, ut de physicis inconsummationis signis ipsi testarentur quae per medicorum artem amissa profitebantur ipsi sponsi, sed ut edocentes de perseverantia illius nervosi morbi, iudicium redderent de inconsummatione a tempore chirurgicae operationis usque ad separationem a viro ; quod rite fecerunt, sive per attestationem scripto datam, sive per iuratas responsiones. Receptae insuper fuerunt extraiudiciales peritiae medicorum, qui diversis temporibus mulieris curas adhibuerunt. His omnibus rite absolutis, Emus Archiepiscopus trans-

misit processum ad H. S. C. et hodie causa iudicanda Vobis EE. PP. proponitur sub dubio in calce exscripto.

Viri patronus suam defensionem a vaginismi descriptione incipit; "Le vaginisme, (inquiunt scriptores) n'est a proprement parler qu'un symptôme. Sous cette dénomination on comprend une excitabilité morbide (morbosa) du vagin, se traduisant par l'hyperesthésie de la vulve et du vagin, et par des contractions spasmodiques du constricteur de la vulve et parfois aussi des muscles du petit bassin et de l'organisme." Ita *Sims*, *Carolus Schroeder*, *Simpson*, *Debout*, *Michon*, *Charrier*, *Marion*, *Scanzoni*, *Courty*, *Hildebrandt*, *Stafeldt*, *Brescky*, *Budius*, aliique quamplurimi. Iure vaginismus appellatur "un symptôme;" nam plus quam morbus est morbi manifestatio, est enim effectus qui causas aliquas praesupponit. Harum causarum, ut scriptores tradunt, aliae locales sunti veluti "l'étroitesse de l'entrée du vagin, la dureté de l'hymen, certaines particularités dans la situation des organs génitaux externes, etc., etc.," aliae autem generales, quae nempe cum physicis mulieris conditionibus connectuntur. Phaenomena vero quae ex vaginismo progigni solent, causarum naturam sequuntur, maiorem scilicet vel minorem explicationem recipiunt, prout vaginismus ex causis generalibus vel localibus profluit. Si enim vaginismus ex causis localibus procedit, tunc phaenomena uti plurimum, muliebria non excedunt. Si autem e morbosa nervorum conditione, idest e causis hystericis oritur, tunc, praeter partium violentam coarctationem et restrictionem "hyperesthésie et contraction spasmodique du vagin" phaenomena generalia habentur, quae nimirum morbi originem praeseferunt, veluti membrorum tremores et contractiones, vomitionum conatus, deliquia, etc. Vaginismus, ait Orator, difficultatem vel impossibilitatem penetrationis secumfert. "Cet état spasmodique, (inquit. Carolus Schroeder in suo Tract. *Maladies des organes de la femme*, traduit par E. Lauwers pag. 530 et seq.) entraine la gêne ou l'impossibilité des rapprochements sexuels, et de l'exploration digitale." Attamen si ex causis localibus procedit, quandoque remedia utiliter adhiberi solent. Sed si causis generalibus iungitur, tunc impossibilis propemodum curatio fit. Agitur enim non de partium, sed de totius corporis vitio, de indole, de natura mulieris, quam corrigere herculeus labor est.

Vaginismus, quo Camilla afficiebatur, prosequitur orator, huius-

modi indolis erat, connectebatur scilicet cum morbosa nervorum conditione, ac proinde maritales actus impossibiles reddere debebat.

Hisce praemissis, orator inconsummationis disputationem aggreditur, quam manifestissimam esse autumat, quia in casu praeter iuratam coniugum fidem, septimae manus testimonio confirmatam, praeter innumera argumenta adminicularia a circumstantiis temporis, loci, personarum collecta, quae *ex cap. laud.* 5, *lib. IV. tit. 14 de frig. et malef.*, ex Doctorum doctrina, ex S.H.O. consuetudine sufficerent ut tuta conscientia in iudiciis super dispensatione sententia proferi possit, occurrit mulieris morbus, cuius natura et gravitas, invincibile pro dispensatione argumentum constituit.

Profecto Robertus sub iurisiurandi fide affirmat matrimonium non fuisse consummatum.

Viri confessioni iuxta Oratorem, consonant mulieris iurata fides. Quanti autem in casu coniugum fides sit facienda, ex actis satis superque constare, adnotat patronus. Agitur enim de sponsis mentiri nesciis, de quorum sinceritate deponunt testes pariter mentire nescii.

Neque iuramentum credulitatis testes dumtaxat perhibent, urget advocatus, sed sub iurisiurandi sanctitate de matrimonii non consummatione se moralem habere certitudinem asserunt. Iamvero quis non videt quanti ista solemnis affirmatio momenti sit, quippe quae ex testibus profluit, qui circumstantiis interfuerunt, qui rerum vices propriis oculis inspexerunt, qui tempore non suspecto confessiones coniugum exceperunt, qui connubii difficultates perpendere potuerunt? Compertum exploratumque in iure est, coniugum confessiones, tempore non suspecto habitas, plurimum ad demonstrationem inconsummationis conferre. Iamvero in casu harum confessionum non interrupta series habetur cui vim adhibent adiuncta loci, temporis, personarum. Et revera, nuptiali adhuc peregrinatione perdurante, Camilla ad avunculum litteras mittit, in quibus abnormes connubii conditiones describit. Post aliquot, a nuptiis initis, dies coniuges adire medicos coguntur. Mense Augusti, eiusdem anni, Camilla rusticatum pergit apud coniuges de Rousiers, ibique hospites ab ea matrimonii inconsummationem discunt. Remedia a medicis adhibita in irritum cadunt, mulieris valetudo ingravescit; consilio medici Petit, operatio chirurgica Parisiis peragitur, Camilla intacta reperitur. Ab operatione usque ad separationem duo anni labuntur. Sed per id etiam temporis, inquit patronus, non semel sed pluries matrimonii inconsummatio a coniugibus confirmatur.

Sed potissimum adminiculare argumentum ex morbo Camillae, et testimoniis medicorum sive extraiudicialium, sive iudicialium erui censet orator. Et revera morbum matrimonii consummationi offecisse in primo matrimonii momento, idest usque ad operationem chirurgicam, ex medicorum testimoniis, qui eam peregerunt luculentissime patet.

In secundo vero momento, idest ab operatione chirurgica usque ad separationem, probatio non minus plena est, iuxta patronum. Et revera, hic ratiocinatur, ut aliquod dubium super non consummatione haberi posset, demonstrari ex adverso deberet, post operationem chirurgicam physicas mulieris conditiones, ex quibus impossibilitas matrimonii consummandi progignebatur, mutatas quoque modo fuisse. Iisdem enim causis positis, iidem sequuntur effectus. Sed haec mutatio, praeterquamquod a iurata et non iurata coniugum fide, praeterquamquod a testium consonis depositionibus, argumentisque innumeris, quae totum cohabitationis spatium complectuntur, et ex quibus luculentissime patet matrimonium in secundo momento, non secus ac in primo, inconsummatum permansisse, excluditur: I. a natura morbi, qui cum physicas mulieris conditiones afficeret, remediis localibus amoveri nequibat; 2. excluditur ab impossibilitate praescripta a medicis operatoribus remedia adhibendi; quomodo enim Camilla in vigilia "speculo" uti potuisset, si sopore artificiis inducto, muliebrium contactus membrorum contractiones excitabat? 3. excluditur a dubiis ipsorum medicorum super operationis effectus "la dilatation et le traitement indiqué après l'opération étaient le "seul moyen qui pût guérir Mme. P. et encore l' efficacité était-"elle incertaine, cest le seul moyen de guérir le vaginisme et encore "n' est-il pas infallible"; 4. excluditur postremo a testimoniis medicorum sive iudicialium, sive extraiudicialium, et a quibus satis superque liquet morbosum mulieris statum, post operationem chirurgicam eumdem permansisse, eoque posito, impossibilem prorsus matrimonii consummationem fuisse.

Immo, arguit Orator, in secundo momento difficultates matrimonii consummandi auxerunt.

Nec minori evidentia, subdit advocatus, deponunt medici iudiciales qui, de mandato Curiae Parisiensis, mulierem inspexerunt.

Post haec patronus causas dispensationis enumerat, et primam in insuperabili coniugum aversione consistere ait. *Corrad. in praxi disp.* 46, 8, *cap.* 3, *n.* 33. Camilla virum fastidit, odit: "Ma nièce a fini par prendre son mari en aversion." Robertus intimo repugnantiae sensu contra mulierem fertur. Ambo autem coniuges cum

septima manu propinquorum fatentur impossibilem reconciliationem esse, immo detrimentosam.

Aletra causa in pertinacia morbi habetur. Prudentia vetat quominus coniuges vitam simul degant.

Tertiam reponit in iudicio separationis apud laicum tribunal a muliere inchoato, quodque iam publice innotuit.

Postrema demum in spirituali utilitate petentis dispensationem, quae plurimi habetur a Perez *De matrim. in disput.* 20 *sect.* 7, *n.* 11: a Sacra Rota *in decis.* 86, *sect.* 7, *post secund. vol. Farinac.* et a pluribus relatis resolut. H. Sac. Congregationis.

Quibus relatis, erit suetae sapientiae EE.VV. sequens sirimere.

DUBIUM.

An sit consulendum SSmo pro dispensatione a matrimonio rato et non consummato in casu.

Cui S. Congregatio die 27 aprilis 1895 respondit: *Affirmative vetito mulieri transitu ad alias nuptias.*

EX SS. RITUUM CONGREGATIONE.

VARIA SOLVUNTUR DUBIA.

Rmus Dnus Ioachimus de Medeisos, Episcopus Macaonensis, Ditionis Lusitaniae apud Sinas, maxime cupiens ut sacri ritus in sua Dioecesi, iuxta ecclesiasticas praescriptiones ab omnibus serventur insequentium dubiorum solutionem a Sacra Rituum Congregatione humiliter petiit, nimirum:

I. Utrum presbyter qui Missam conventualem de Octava Omnium Sanctorum die 2 Novembris celebrat, possit ex parte uti concessione a Benedicto Papa XIV facta Regno Lusitaniae dicendi *tres* Missas pro defunctis, *alias duas* Missas de Requie celebrando?

II. Utrum occurrente *prima feria sexta* Novembris die quo fit commemoratio Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum liceat Missam votivam celebrare de Sanctissimo Corde Iesu iuxta decretum Sacrae Rituum Congregationis 28 Iunii 1889?

III. Et quatenus affirmative ad II utrum eadem die apud Lusitanos liceat celebranti praeter praedictam Missam votivam, duas alias de *Requie* celebrare?

IV. Utrum feria V in Coena Domini in Missa Pontificali Presbyter et diaconi assistentes, Canonicus baculum sustinens pluviali

paratus, et Subdiaconus, si sint Presbyteri, stolam assumere debeant priusquam de manu Episcopi communionem accipiant; an potius ad Sacram Synaxim teneantur accedere iisdem tantum modo paramentis, quibus utebantur ab initio Missae?

V. Utrum festum Ss. Cordis Jesu quod inter festa secundaria duplicia Primae classis in Calendario Universali ex Decreto 22 Augusti 1893 a Sacra Rituum Congregatione recensetur, quodque iamdiu apud Lusitanos ut primarium celebratur sub praecepto in utroque foro, addito etiam ieiunio pervigilii, nunc vi laudati Decreti celebrari debeat ut secundarium; an potius ut primarium in Lusitana Ditione retinendum sit?

VI. Utrum consuetudo, qua simplex Sacerdos vel Canonicus Missam solemnem celebrans, concionatorem, qui post Evangelium praedicat, benedict, servari possit?

VII. Utrum Sacerdos qui festo Nativitatis Domini, vel die secunda Novembris in Lusitania, tres Missas consecutive legit, quin ab altari recedat, teneatur post unamquamque Missam recitare ter *Ave Maria, Salve Regina* et ceteras orationes iussu Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Leonis Papae XIII recitandas post Missam privatam, an potius semel tantum post tertiam Missam.

VIII. Utrum in choro ad Psalmum *Venite exultemus*, recitandum in tertio Nocturno festi Epiphaniae Domini teneantur omnes etiam Canonici stare detectis capitibus, dum praedictus Psalmus cum antiphona recitatur?

IX. Utrum occurrente Festo Annuntiationis Beatae Mariae Virginis feria VI in Parasceve vel Sabbato Sancto, in locis ubi hoc festum celebratur sub praecepto audiendi Sacrum et abstinendi ab operibus servilibus, transferri debeat ad feriam secundam post Dominicam in Albis cum praecepto etiam pro populo?

X. Utrum feria VI in Parasceve retineri possit consuetudo in adoratione Crucis, ut ille, qui adorationem peregit, non recedat facta cruci genuflexione unico genu, sed ter genuflexionem faciendo utroque genu?

———

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, ac referente subscripto Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Secretario, omnibus accurate perpensis, propositis Dubiis respondere censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative.*

Ad II. *Negative, iuxta Rubricas.*

Ad III. *Provisum in praecedentibus.*

Ad IV. *Negative quoad primam partem, Affirmative quoad secundam.*

Ad V. *Attento speciali privilegio Festum Ss. Cordis Iesu in Regno Lusitaniae est per accidens primarium.*

Ad VI. *Affirmative iuxta alia Decreta.*

Ad VII. *Negative, preces praescriptae recitentur in fine ultimae Missae.*

Ad VIII. *Servetur consuetudo.*

Ad IX. *Detur Decretum generale die 12 Februarii 1690.*

Ad X. *Post adorationem et osculum sanctae Crucis celebrans, ministri, clerus et populus surgant, genuflectant unico genu et redeant ad propriam sedem.*

Atque ita rescripsit et servari mandavit.

Die 10 Maii 1895.

C. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA *S. R. C. Praef.*
ALOISIUS TRIPEP *S. C. R. Secret.*

EX S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

CIRCA SCAPULARE SANCTI JOSEPH.

Fr. Minorum S. Francisci Cappuccinorum.

Minister Generalis Ordinis FF. Minorum S. Francisci Cappucinorum exponit, quod Scapulare S. Ioseph Protectoris Ecclesiasiae universalis, instante Procuratore Generali praefacti Ordinis, ex Decreto SS. Rituum Cong. diei 15 Aprilis 1893 approbatum fuit et dein per Rescriptum S. Cong. Indulgentiarum diei 8 Junii 1893 s. Indulgentiarum ditatum.

Hanc porro novellam formam cultus erga praeclarum Sponsum Immaculatae Virginis gratissimum fuisse ubique terrarum Christifidelibus in compertum evasit ex eo quod Scapularia S. Joseph a data praelaudati Rescripti millena millenaque expetita fuerint ac distributa.

Nunc autem dubium oritur, haud sine aliquali praesertim Sacerdotum Ordinis anxietate circa quamdam praelaudati Decreti clausulam, nempe: "sub conditione ut color et forma praefati Scapularis sit eadem ac illa quae jam obtinet in dioecesi Veronensi."

Et reapse vi praefati Decreti omissa forma primaeva Scapularis albi S. Ioseph, forma et color Scapularis Veronensis illico adop ata fuere, nempe: panniculus ex lana violaceus, supra quo, tamquam supra principaliori, assuitur alius panniculus flavus ex quadam textura, ut videtur lanae et gossypii, imagini S. Ioseph imprimendae sat idonea ; utrumque petiolum, nempe ex parte pectoris ex parte humerorum, consueto more colligat fascia alba.

Porro inter varia Scapularis Veronen. exemplaria hinc inde sparsa quaedam apparet discrepantia, eo quod pars violacea videtur ex gossypio cum quadam mixtura intextus ; pars vero flava, in qua depingitur imago S. Joseph, similis apparet lanae laminatae aut huiusmodi : non enim possibile est imaginem imprimere supra lana reticulata ; et aliunde utrumque petiolum Scapularis non fascia sed cordula retinetur.

Jam vero quum haec inter utrumque Scapulare discrepantia disceptationes ingenerare queat, hinc humilis Orator hanc S. Cong. Indulg. Sacrisque Relig. praepositam supplex adit, ut benigne declarare degnetur Scapulare prouti supra descriptum et nunc apud PP. Cappuccinos in usu receptum, quum revera formam et colorem retineat illius Veronen. juxta id quod S. Rituum Congregatio praescripsit, haberi posse uti legitimum, ita ut qui fideles praedictum Scapulare induerint, gaudeant indulgentiis aliisque spiritualibus gratiis illud gestantibus concessis.

Porro S. Cong. Indulgentiarum omnibus perpensis declaravit : Praefati Scapularis usum uti legitimum retineri posse, ideoque fideles illud gestantes gaudere omnibus Indulgentiis eidem adnexis.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congreg. die 6 Maii 1895.

FR. IGNATIUS *Card.* PERSICO, *Praef.*
ALEX. *Achiep.* NICOPOLITANVS, *Secr.*

BOOK REVIEW.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION. The State of Ohio vs. the Rev. Patrick Quigley, D.D. Published by Robert Drummond, 444 Pearl street, New York; for sale by Messrs. Brown, Eager & Hulls, 409-411 Summit street, Toledo, O. Large 8vo, pages 16 and 598. Price, $5.00.

This famous case is still fresh in the memory of our readers. April 15, 1889, a law was passed by the Legislature of Ohio, compelling "all parents, guardians and other persons who have care of children, to instruct them, or cause them to be instructed, in spelling, reading, writing, English grammar, geography, arithmetic, ..." and furthermore, "to send such child or children (between the ages of eight and fourteen) to a public or private school for a period of not less than twenty weeks in city districts in each year; . . . . and in village districts, not less than sixteen weeks each year."

The same law enacts that principals and teachers of schools, whether public or private, shall report to the Board of Education the names, ages and residence of all pupils in attendance at their schools. With this clause Dr. Quigley refused to comply. He was indicted to stand trial before the Court of Common Pleas, and was sentenced to fine and costs. He appealed to the Circuit Court, which ratified the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas, and thence to the Supreme Court of the State, which gave judgment to the same effect.

Dr. Quigley was represented in the three instances by ex-Chief-Justice Edmund F. Dunne, of Florida, and by Judge Ritchie and Hon. Frank Hurd, of Toledo. The chief contention of Dr. Quigley and his counsel was that the law was unconstitutional—that is, contrary to those inalienable natural rights which are guaranteed to its citizens by the Constitution of Ohio. This position was most ably maintained particularly by ex-Judge Dunne, whose arguments

displayed astounding erudition, as well as invincible logic, powerful reasoning, and that luminous eloquence for which the learned jurist is noted.

The arguments of Judge Ritchie and Frank Hurd, which deal with the more technical features of the case, are likewise masterly in their kind. The book contains also the arguments of the counsel for the State as far as they could be secured. There is a complete analytical table of contents, and a valuable alphabetical Index.

The book opens with a calm, clear and concise introductory statement of the case by the Rev. Dr. Quigley himself. "My objection was," he says, "that the whole law was based on the first section of it, which assumed that the State had the right to the entire control of the subject of education to the extent of fixing one general standard of knowledge up to which every parent was bound to educate his children, regardless of age, sex or condition in life, and to do so in such way, and at such time and place and to such extent as the State chose to prescribe."

This case has been carried through the courts of the State of Ohio. An appeal still remains to the Supreme Court of the United States. But before taking this appeal, Dr. Quigley appeals to the common sense of the American people by putting both sides before them in the volume before us. This he has done at an enormous expense, and he certainly deserves the gratitude of all those interested in this momeutous question. The time will surely come—and we do not believe it to be far distant—when the question of the rights of parents and the rights of the State in the education of children will have to be defined in this country. When that struggle shall come Dr. Quigley's book will be eagerly sought for. As it is, we believe that "Compulsory Education" should find a place in every priest's library. J. C.

GESCHICHTE DES COLLEGIUM GERMANICUM Hungaricum in Rom. Von Cardinal Andreas Steinhuber, S.J. Two Volumes.—Freiburg, Br., B. Herder. (St. Louis, Mo.) 1895.

The intense intellectual activity of the Jesuits is at present nowhere more apparent than in Rome. The Gregorian University, which is under the exclusive charge of the Society, numbers, according to the last catalogue 985 students. These represent twenty-one

different nationalities and, what is more remarkable still, some thirty religious Orders whose most promising scholastics are sent here from all parts, to profit by the teaching of the Sons of St. Ignatius. Conspicuous among the different colleges that gather daily in the courts of the University, are the alumni of the *Collegio Germanico.* They are distinguished not only by their red gowns, but by their deportment which betokens severe habits of study and close self-discipline. They add to the thorough classical course of the German gymnasium three years of mental philosophy and four years of theology. One cannot look upon these young men in the streets of Rome or at their studies in the well equipped college which they inhabit, without feeling that they are destined, almost without exception, to become each a mighty power for good in the sphere assigned their future activity. What the students of the *Germanicum* are to-day, they have been since St. Ignatius established the college, more than three centuries ago. Germany had inflicted a deep wound upon the Church; she had brought forth the teacher who, rebelling against the authority of the Spouse of Christ, cast the seeds of disloyalty and doubt among the masses. The people followed the standard-bearer of rebellion because their appointed shepherds had ceased to care for them, and turned largely hirelings. But Germany has also made amends. Since the founding of the *Collegio Germanico* she has seen many sturdy defenders of the ancient faith who had been trained in the centre of Christendom, return to her and lift anew the standard of loyalty to the Church. The list of alumni of the college bears the names of 28 cardinals, more than 400 bishops and superiors of different religious Orders, and not a few martyrs who laid down their lives in heroic sacrifice for the cause of Christ which they had espoused.

To have the records of such an institution is surely an advantage to the student of ecclesiastical history, apart from the edification and pleasant instruction which a work of this kind furnishes by its multitude of biographical sketches, accounts of priestly activity, and varied illustration in the of field education, particularly clerical training. The first published history of the college had appeared in 1770, but it covered only the formative period, that is to say the first thirty years of its existence. P. Julius Cordara, the author, had availed himself of the labor of two predecessors, the celebrated P. Cattaneo, S J., and the German Jesuit William Fusban, who left some valuable MS. material collected between 1652 and 1683. It is easily seen, therefore, how much of the work of completing the history of the

German College devolved upon the present illustrious writer, Cardinal Steinhuber, who received his training in the college and became in later years its rector, a position which he held for thirteen years.

It is hardly necessary to comment on the method or the style of Cardinal Steinhuber's work, the importance of which is sufficiently characterized by its scope aud purpose. Each period of this history throws some definite light upon the development of ecclesiastical life in Germany, Austria and incidentally upon the Church in other countries, such as Italy and Belgium. It is a worthy contribution to the history of Catholicity and of education since the time of the so-called "reformation."

LA SAINTE ÉGLISE AU SIÈCLE DES APÔTRES. Par. M. l'abbé H. Lesêtre. Approbation de S. E. Card. Richard. Paris: P. Lethielleux. Pg. xii, 670. Pr. 6 frcs.

Few men in France have contributed more to render the exegesis of the Old and New Testaments accessible to the educated laity than the Abbé Lesêtre. His work has not, however, been confined to the systematic and more or less scientific exposition of the Sacred Text, such as we find it in the volume on the Psalms. His familiarity with the subject matter of the Scriptures, particularly the Gospels, had led him, on a former occasion, to give us a descriptive history of our Lord's life which has proved to be greatly popular, not only on account of the manner in which the Gospel narrative is treated, but by reason of the erudition which the author weaves into his historical account of Christ. The favorable judgment which has been passed upon the Abbé Lesêtre's *N. S. Jesus Christ dans son Evangile* is fully borne out by the present publication, which describes the history and constitution of the Apostolic Church, from the day of Pentecost to the death of St. John at Ephesus, sixty-eight years after the resurrection of Christ.

In the first part (pp. 1–99) we have the preaching and unfolding of the Evangelical doctrine among the Jews until the dispersion of the Apostles. The second, by far the largest part of the work (pp. 100–416), deals with the spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles and in particular with the mission of St. Paul. The third and last part beginning with the siege of Jerusalem, pictures the gradual growth, the humiliations and conquests of the Church. In connection with the edifying history of St. John, around which the

activity of the Apostolic College groups itself after the death of SS. Peter and Paul, we have an interesting analysis of the letter addressed to the Corinthians by St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, whose life as Pope closes the first century of the Christian era. Another celebrated document, first discovered toward the end of the sixteenth century, and which throws much light upon the practices of the early Christians, is the apologetic Epistle addressed to a certain Diognetes. It answers the three questions as to the characteristic features of the Christian religion, the nature of Christian charity, and the reasons for its deferred promulgation. Of this and other like resources, such as the discoveries of early Christian writings by Briennios, our author makes excellent use, throwing a fresh light upon the development of Catholic doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline. To the illustration of this development in particular, as it has affected the dogmatic and moral teaching of the Church in later days, the last five chapters are exclusively devoted.

The work is in every way worthy of the august subject which it treats, and forms a unique addition to that class of literary productions which connect the sciences of theology and ecclesiastical history.

MOOTED QUESTIONS OF HISTORY. By H. J. Desmond, A.M. New York and Chicago. Benziger Bros. Price 75 cents.

Quite a valuable little book which compiles the data of history and the judgments of historians fairly supposed to be free from bias, regarding some "mediaeval issues" and "events of Protestantism," which popularly receive a one-sided treatment detrimental to the Catholic cause. The testimony of a man like Maitland, who was a very decided Protestant, in behalf of the "lazy monks" and the action of the clergy in the "dark ages" generally, is much more effective in dissipating prejudice, than any amount of facts drawn from our own historians would be. The same may be said of other writers on similarly mooted questions as are the Power of the Popes, the Bible before Luther, Indulgences, Mary and Elizabeth, the Inquisition, the Jesuits, Galileo, Guy Fawkes, and a host of others which our author touches with a knowing and discriminating hand.

We venture to suggest that the "Imprimatur" would have

added to the value of the book and its readier distribution, inasmuch as such indication settles at once any doubt, as to the writer's good faith, in the minds of those who are left to judge the worth of the statements from the title alone.

PETIT GUIDE DU PREDICATEUR. Traduit de l'Italien du R. P. Gallerani, S.J.; par M. l'abbé Ch. Vallée, Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1895. Pg. 181. Pr. Frcs. 1.25.

Those who have heard P. Gallerani preach or give conferences in Rome know that his views on the subject of pulpit duty are not simply theory. He is one of the most finished, but also one of the most practical preachers of our day. The little work before us, first published in Italian, is a sort of commentary upon the Circular Letter on Preaching sent last year by the S. Congregation to the Bishops of Italy, which we reprinted at the time in our supplement to the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. The subject matter is divided into seven parts, addressed in form of letters to a young priest. It deals with the essential qualities of the preacher; with the choice and arrangement of matter or topics; it contrasts the utility of conferences with their abuse; shows the danger of sentimentalism in preaching, and warns against the mere desire to please as absorbing the aim of being useful. Apart from the substantial doctrine which we find here condensed to guide the young preacher in his difficult task, the little work is written in a charming style which renders its reading and the assimilation of its precepts and counsels an easy and pleasing matter. We heartily recommend an English translation of this little "guide."

ELEMENTS OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. By Father Humphrey, S.J.—London and Leamington: Art and Book Company (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros.), 1895.

Suarez' treatise on "The Religious State," in three volumes, published some years ago by our author, and well known, no doubt, to directors of the spiritual life, is hardly accessible to the average member of our religious orders, whose active duties oblige them to limit their reading to a choice, among excellent books, of those which are less bulky. Nevertheless the work of Suarez is one which treats with consummate skill all the phases of religious life, and which places principles and their application in such form

as to give the treatise a permanent value. It was a fruitful suggestion, therefore, which prompted Fr. Humphrey to abridge the large edition and to give us its marrow in a volume which places the matter within the reach of all whom the subject of religion concerns.

But it must not be imagined that we have here simply a translation of the work of the illustrious Spanish Jesuit, in choice selections however orderly compiled. The work of Fr. Humphrey is built on Suarez, but abounds in illustrations from modern writers and theologians, which confirm the aptness and sound bearings of the ascetical teaching of the scholastics. Nor is the work exclusively intended for guidance into and through the religious life wherein its members have bound themselves to the observance of the three great vows. There is much in it which concerns priests and bishops of the secular clergy who have a pastoral charge, and are thus bound to a state of perfection, not merely to be *acquired* as in the religious life, but to be *exercised*. For this reason "the state of Bishops," says the author, "is more perfect than is any religious state."

The State of Perfection in its fundamental notions, and the constitution of the religious state as an expression of the aim at perfection, form the introductory chapters. Then follow the requirements for entrance, the character of the vows and other obligations, and the various duties of the religious life. The eleventh chapter treats of "Departure from Religious Life" in conscience or outwardly. Here too the very important subject of modifications of an Order from its first institution is dealt with under various heads of dispensation and privileges. The last part of the volume is devoted to a consideration of the variety of religious life within the religious state.

The subject altogether is one which merits the careful study of all those who have charge of religious communities. Many circumstances point to the necessity of modifications here and there in the life of a religious community so that it may fulfill the purpose of its existence in a proper way and without hindrance. At the same time there should be no practical deviation from traditional observance which affects the principle of religious conservatism by a change of constitution. To discern the right medium belongs to minds familiar with the elements and motives of religious life, a knowledge which is obtained from such books as the one before us.

OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By Sylvester Joseph Hunter, S.J. Vol. II.—London: Longmans. Green & Co. 1895. Pp. 596.

A short time ago we reviewed the first volume of Fr. Hunter's "Outlines," which is part of the Stonyhurst series of manuals in the study of philosophy and theology. The present volume is the second of three which will complete the subject of Catholic Dogma. The author apologizes for his possible failure to satisfy the demands of all inquirers regarding the topics and points to be treated in a limited compendium of theology. We doubt whether any one could justly complain of partiality or omission in the present case, unless he regard a scientific text-book of Christian doctrine in the light of an encyclopædia of theological science. Of course we take for granted that a book of this kind is meant for the student who seeks knowledge of Catholic theology in a systematic, that is to say, in a reasonable way. However popular is the style or lucid the exposition of a treatise like the one before us, the themes which it treats are involved by an intimate connection one with the other. If the main, the fundamental arguments are kept clearly and in due order before the mind, all side issues receive their argumentative light from the analogy of definite doctrine, which those only fail to apply who lack a solid hold on the principal evidence. Nevertheless there are some secondary phases of Catholic teaching which receive a momentary prominence by reason of certain fashionable theories in religion or science that take hold of the public mind for a time or in a place without bidding fair to elicit a like interest in another generation. These, whilst they are really confuted by fundamental principles of long standing, demand often a new method of applying these principles and call for a new terminology or for distinctions in the old. Such seem to us the questions of Ontologism, of the scientia media, of the divine procession, the "six days," etc. These topics are by no means overlooked in Fr. Hunter's popular theology, and his choice of them has been sufficiently typical to give the intelligent reader the means of classifying and solving such questions of passing importance in controversy, which he does not actually elaborate. The theory of "evolution" in the chapter on the "Origin of Man" is a fine example of the practical treatment which such subjects should receive, and the reader, whilst being made familiar with the various arguments of evolutionists, is led to the obvious conclusion that, whatever theories he may admit as account-

ing for the present position of man in the animal kingdom, there is no scientific defense of any one system which supersedes in reasonableness the theory of immediate creation, and that therefore the effort of Catholic scientists to prove the evolutionist theory correct is an altogether aimless one.

The present volume contains the treatises on God and His perfections, the Creation, Man, the Incarnation and ends with three chapters on the Blessed Virgin Mary. There is, as in the first volume, a convenient and full index of topics. Students of theology and educated Catholics generally who look for a thorough and clear demonstration of their faith, will greatly welcome these Outlines of Catholic Theology. The third volume is announced as in press, to be ready before the end of the year.

COMPENDIUM LITURGIAE SACRAE juxta ritum Romanum in Missae celebratione et officii recitatione. Auctore Jos. Aertnys, C.SS.R. Theol. Moral. et. S. Liturgiae Profess. Paderbornae Ferdinand Schoeningh. 1895. Fg. vii. 138. Pr. Mk. $1.40.

SACRA LITURGIA. Caeremoniale seu Manuale ad Functiones sacras solemnes rite peregendas. Ad usum Alumnorum Seminarii Archiep, Mechliniens. opera. J. F. Van der Stappen, Episc. tit. Joppen. New York: Benziger Bros. 1895. Fg. 332.

Although there is no "Compendium S. Liturgiae" which at present so fully meets the wants of the American clergy as Wapelhorst's excellent work on the subject we are justified in calling attention to the above two manuals as meeting each a distinct purpose of liturgical study. P. Aertnys confines himself to the exposition of the rites and rubrics to be observed in the celebration of the Mass and the Divine Office. But in doing so he takes account of all the varying circumstances under which the mass and offices are to be performed, and thus supplies answers to many doubts which occur in the reading of the rubrics, particularly to a celebrant in a strange diocese or one who is deprived of the "ordo." The fact that we have an experienced theologian, such as Fr. Aertnys is, interpret for us the right practice of the rubrics is a decided advantage in as much as it settles many troublesome cases of conscience due to scrupulosity on the part of a priest.